

Irreducible private states

K. Horodecki

*Institute of Informatics, National Quantum Information Centre, Faculty of Mathematics,
Physics and Informatics, University of Gdańsk, 80-308 Gdańsk, Poland*

P. Źwikliński and A. Rutkowski

*Institute of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics,
National Quantum Information Centre, Faculty of Mathematics,
Physics and Informatics, University of Gdańsk, 80-308 Gdańsk, Poland*

M. Studziński

DAMTP, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB30WA, UK

Hereunder, we study the class of irreducible private states that are private states from which all the secret content is accessible via measuring their key part. We provide the first protocol which distills key not only from the key part, but also from the shield if only the state is reducible. We prove also a tighter upper bound on its performance. This implies in particular that the irreducible private states are all strictly irreducible if and only if the entangled but key-undistillable states ("bound key states") exist. In turn, all the irreducible private states of the dimension $4 \otimes 4$ are strictly irreducible, that is, after an attack on the key part they become separable states. Providing the bound key states exist, we consider different subclasses of the irreducible private states and their properties. Finally we show a possible way to apply our findings in the context of quantum key repeaters. As a step towards this direction, we provide a lower bound on the trace norm distance between key-undistillable states and private states, in sufficiently high dimensions, yet not large enough to reach the goal of application. However this bound leads to the proof of no-key swapping for some private states in the single copy case without using the fact that they are strictly irreducible.

Obtaining the classical secret key for data encryption via quantum states is no doubt one of the main contributions of quantum information theory towards security in the era of information [1]. This goal has been achieved using the celebrated maximally entangled state [2–4]. However, the quantum states which have a property that after the measurement one can get at least m bits of a secret secure key (against quantum eavesdropper) form a much broader class of states called private states [5]. The maximally entangled state is an example of a private state. In general, the private state has two subsystems: the key part (AB) and the shield ($A'B'$). From the key part one can obtain the secure key via von Neumann measurements on its local subsystems, while the shield is protecting the key part from the Eavesdropper who holds the purifying system of the total state. More precisely, any private state with at least m bits of key has the form

$$\gamma_{ABA'B'} = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{ij} |ii\rangle\langle jj|_{AB} \otimes U_i \sigma_{A'B'} U_j^\dagger, \quad (1)$$

where σ is an arbitrary state on $A'B'$ and U_i are unitary transformations. These states were used to formalize quantitative relations between secrecy and entanglement. Namely, it has been shown that the classical secure key is in fact an entanglement measure denoted as K_D [5, 6]. This led to upper bounds on the secure content of quantum states via *relative entropy of entanglement* [5–7] and *squashed entanglement* [8–11] and further generalizations for quantum channels via *squashed entanglement of a quantum channel* [12, 13] and relative entropy of en-

tanglement extended to quantum channel [14] (see also [15–18] in this context). Recently, there has been shown a related impossibility result that one can not achieve non-negligible amount of key [19] in the framework of quantum repeaters [20] using certain approximate private states (a problem of quantum *key-repeaters*). The importance of this class of states follows from the fact that any quantum key distribution protocol (including the so called quantum device independent ones [21, 22]) is equivalent to a protocol which distills private states.

In fact, one can narrow the target states of any quantum key distribution protocol to a much smaller class of the so called *irreducible private states*. These are states which, having local dimension d of the key part have *exactly* $\log d$ bits of key, contrary to an arbitrary private state that can have more key as, in principle, one could use the shield part as a source of key. This class has not been characterized so far. Only one subclass was known [23] which is the private states satisfying $\sigma_i = U_i \sigma U_i^\dagger$ in Eq. (1) being separable for all $i \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$, called in [24] as *strictly irreducible states*.

The main result of this manuscript is a partial characterization of irreducible private states via designing the first protocol that is able to distill key not only from the key part but also from the shield of the system (in cases where $\sigma_i \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}$ is key distillable). On $\gamma_{ABA'B'}$ from Eq. (1) it achieves the rate

$$\log d + \frac{1}{d} K_D(\sigma_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}). \quad (2)$$

Although we state here the result for bipartite private

state, we prove that it holds true also for *multipartite* version of private states introduced in [6]. This allows us to prove that irreducible private states have states σ_i with a zero distillable key: $K_D(\sigma_i) = 0$ for all $i \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$. In turn, we fully characterize the set of private states of the $2 \otimes 2$ dimensional key part and shield, as strictly irreducible.

It is not known if entangled key-distillable ("bound key") states exist. Their existence would break the link between entanglement and security to some extent, showing that these two phenomena are inequivalent. Providing such states exist, we consider different classes of irreducible states: those for which K_D equals to some entanglement measure which is an upper bound on it: relative entropy of entanglement, E_r [25], its regularized version E_r^∞ , and squashed entanglement I_{sq} [26]. We show that these sets are close under the tensor product (see, [24] for analogous statement for the set of approximate strictly irreducible private states). However, if bound key states *do not* exist, then we fully characterize the class of irreducible private states as the set of strictly irreducible private states which in fact satisfies $K_D(\gamma) = E_r(\gamma)$.

We also show a possible way to an important application of our main result. Namely M. Christandl and R. Ferrara have shown in [24] that strictly irreducible private states have the amount of key achieved via key-repeaters bounded from above by distillable entanglement of $\gamma \otimes \gamma$. We show that to extend this result to *all* irreducible private states, which would answer the question of their role in key-repeaters it is enough that all states with zero distillable key are far in the trace norm from any private state. This problem seems to be hard, as there is no evidence that there even exist states with zero distillable key. We give a lower bound on the latter distance. It is low enough to remain the main application elusive, however it leads to the proof of no-key swapping for some private states in the single copy case without using the fact that the private states are strictly irreducible. We obtain it by providing a *necessary condition of key-undistillability*.

The paper is organized as follows. Section I provides definitions that are further used on. Section II contains the main result, which is a tighter lower bound on distillable key of private states. We present there the protocol of key distillation which uses both the key part and the shield of a private state. We also give an upper bound on its rate. Section III is devoted to some properties of the set of irreducible private states, including its partial characterization. In Section IV we discuss a possible application of our result in the context of quantum key repeaters, while in Section V we provide a lower bound on distance of key-undistillable states from private states via the necessary condition of key-undistillability as well as show its applications to single copy quantum key repeaters. In Section VI we study approximate irreducible states in the light of considerations of Section III. The last section is devoted to the discussion of the above results.

I. NOTATIONS AND DEFINITIONS

In this section we introduce all necessary definitions and notations which we will use further in this manuscript. Let us start from the definition of the private state (pdit) [7]:

Definition 1 (of private state). *A state $\rho_{ABA'B'}$ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_B} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_{A'}} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_{B'}}$ with dimensions $d_A = d_B = d$, $d_{A'}$ and $d_{B'}$, of the form*

$$\gamma_d \equiv \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i,j=0}^{d-1} |e_i f_j\rangle \langle e_j f_j|_{AB} \otimes U_i \sigma_{A'B'} U_j^\dagger, \quad (3)$$

where the state $\sigma_{A'B'}$ is an arbitrary state of subsystem $A'B'$, U_i 's are arbitrary unitary transformations and $\{|e_i\rangle\}_{i=0}^{d-1}, \{|f_j\rangle\}_{j=0}^{d-1}$ are local bases on A and B respectively, is called the private state or pdit. In the case of $d = 2$, the state in (3) is called - pbit. Further in the text we will use interchangeably the notation of the private state, i.e. $\gamma_d, \gamma_{ABA'B'}$ or simply γ , and sometimes we will drop lower indexes when there is no danger of confusion.

Without loss of generality, in what follows we will set $\{|e_i\rangle \otimes |f_j\rangle\}$ basis to be computational for simplicity, while all the facts hold for a general case of arbitrary product basis of a pdit. The part AB of a pdit is called *the key part*, while the subsystem $A'B'$ its *shield*. For any pdit $\gamma_d \in \mathcal{C}^d \otimes \mathcal{C}^d \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_{A'}} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_{B'}}$, which is secure in the standard basis by $\sigma_i^{A'B'} \equiv \sigma_i$ for $i = 0, \dots, d-1$ we denote states which appear on the shield of the pdit, after obtaining an outcome $|ii\rangle_{AB}$ in the measurement performed in the standard basis on its key part. We call the states σ_i the *conditional states*.

Next, we introduce all entanglement measures which are employed further in this manuscript and also the definition of the distillable key is given.

Definition 2. *The relative entropy of entanglement for an arbitrary density operator ρ is defined as*

$$E_r(\rho) \equiv \inf_{\omega \in \mathcal{SEP}} D(\rho|\omega), \quad (4)$$

where the infimum runs over the set of separable states $\mathcal{SEP}$, and $D(\cdot|\cdot)$ denotes relative entropy, i.e. $D(\rho|\sigma) \equiv \text{Tr} \rho \log \rho - \text{Tr} \rho \log \sigma$, for an arbitrary density operators ρ, σ .

Definition 3. *The regularized relative entropy of entanglement for an arbitrary density operator ρ is defined as*

$$E_r^\infty(\rho) \equiv \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} E_r(\rho^{\otimes n}), \quad (5)$$

where E_r is the relative entropy of entanglement given in (2).

Definition 4. The squashed entanglement [27] for an arbitrary bipartite state ρ_{AB} is defined as

$$I_{sq}(\rho_{AB}) \equiv \inf_{\rho_{ABE}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} I(A; B|E) \mid \rho_{ABE} \text{ extension of } \rho_{AB} \right\}. \quad (6)$$

The infimum is taken over all extensions of ρ_{AB} , i.e. over all density operators ρ_{ABE} with $\rho_{AB} = \text{Tr}_E \rho_{ABE}$. By $I(A; B|E) \equiv S(AE) + S(BE) - S(ABE) - S(E)$ we denote the quantum conditional mutual information of ρ_{ABE} [28]. $S(A) \equiv S(\rho_A)$ is the von Neumann entropy of the underlying state.

Definition 5. The distillable key for an arbitrary bipartite state ρ_{AB} is defined as the rate at which private states can be distilled under bipartite LOCC operations $\Lambda_{A:B}$ [5]:

$$K_D(\rho_{AB}) \equiv \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\Lambda_{A:B}} \{K : \|\Lambda(\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}) - \gamma^{nK}\|_1 \leq \epsilon\}, \quad (7)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_1$ denotes the trace norm.

Definition 6. For an arbitrary bipartite state ρ_{AB} by distillable entanglement [29] we understand the following quantity:

$$E_D(\rho_{AB}) \equiv \sup \left\{ r : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\inf_{\Lambda} \|\Lambda(\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}) - \Phi(2^{rn})\|_1 \right] = 0 \right\}, \quad (8)$$

where Λ denotes trace preserving bipartite LOCC map and $\Phi(2^{rn})$ denotes maximally entangled state of Schmidt rank 2^{rn} . The distillable entanglement of a state ρ_{AB} can be understood as the rate at which maximally entangled states can be distilled under bipartite LOCC operations.

We now come to the central definition to all our further considerations:

Definition 7. Private state $\gamma_{d,d'}$ is called irreducible iff $K_D(\gamma_{d,d'}) = \log d$. The set of irreducible private states with local dimension of key part d and total dimension of the shield part d' , will be denoted as $\mathcal{IR}_{d,d'}$.

We will sometimes suppress the dimension subscript from notation in $\mathcal{IR}_{d,d'}$. An important subset of the $\mathcal{IR}$ is the set of strictly irreducible private states defined as follows:

Definition 8. [24] We say a private state γ is strictly irreducible private state denoted as $\langle \gamma \rangle$ or $\gamma^{(d)}$ if the state $\gamma = \frac{1}{d} \sum_i |ii\rangle\langle ii| \otimes U_i \sigma U_i^\dagger$ is separable, i.e. γ consists of separable states on the diagonal $U_i \sigma U_i \in \mathcal{SEP}$.

II. PROTOCOL OF DISTILLING KEY FROM PRIVATE STATES

Here, we will present the protocol which enables the characterization of irreducible private states. As announced, it can distill the key not only from the key

part but also from the shield of a private state in the case where $\sigma_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}$ is distillable. We first show its rate, which is the main result of this section and the core of our further reasoning in this manuscript. Here we state the result for bipartite private states, however analogues result holds as well for the case of multipartite private states [6], as we show in Appendix D.

The distillable key can be lower bounded as follows:

Theorem 1. For a private state γ_d , there is

$$K_D(\gamma_d) \geq \log d + \frac{1}{d} K_D(\sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}). \quad (9)$$

We achieve the above result via the following protocol defined by parameters m and k . The input to the protocol $P(m, k)$ is $\gamma^{\otimes(m \times k)}$. This protocol depends on a threshold $\delta(m)$ which approaches 0 with increasing m . We fix the value of this threshold later, when study the rate of this protocol.

1. For each of k blocks of m states Alice and Bob repeat items 2-6 as follows:
2. Alice and Bob measure their subsystems of the key part A and B in the secure basis of γ .
3. If number $t_s(m)$ of any symbol $s \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ in the key $|i_0\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |i_m\rangle$ with $i_j \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ is below the threshold $\delta(m)$, i.e. $|\frac{m}{d} - t_s(m)| > \delta(m)$, they trace out the original state, produce the error state $|e\rangle_{AA'} \otimes |e\rangle_{BB'}$. They then proceed with step 2 on the next block if such is left, or go directly to step 7 otherwise. If however $|\frac{m}{d} - t_s(m)| \leq \delta(m)$ for all s , they proceed with the steps 4 – 6 of the protocol.
4. Alice and Bob perform each control-permutation operation: depending on the value of the key $|i_0\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |i_m\rangle$ with $i_j \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ they permute states on the systems $A'B'$ from its original form $\sigma_{i_0} \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{i_m}$ to $\sigma_0^{\otimes t_0(m)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}^{\otimes t_{d-1}(m)}$.
5. If necessary Alice and Bob trace out some of the states $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_d$ leaving only $t_{\min}(m) = \lceil \frac{m}{d} - \delta(m) \rceil$ of copies of the state $\sigma \equiv \sigma_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}$.
6. As a subprotocol, Alice and Bob perform on systems $A'B'$ any optimal key distillation protocol of the state σ , acting on $(\sigma_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{d-1})^{\otimes t_{\min}(m)}$, with output close in the trace norm to the state $\gamma_{A'B'A''B''}$. The state on systems AB from the item 3 and state on systems $A'B'A''B''$ form one of the k input states for the final step 7 of the protocol.
7. On k output states of the k repetitions of items 2-6 (or items 2 – 3 if unsuccessful in item 3 respectively) Alice and Bob perform the Devetak-Winter protocol [30].

The proof of Theorem 1 is given in Appendix. We provide here briefly the idea. First let us note, that if the state $\sigma = \sigma_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}$ is key-undistillable, then there is obvious protocol of distilling $\log d$ of key from γ_d : just via measuring its key part. Hence in case $K_D(\sigma) = 0$, our bound is trivially satisfied. Thus in what follows we will assume that $K_D(\sigma) > 0$. It is intuitive that given the key from key part has been used, there are remaining states on the shield part. The major obstacle is that these two parts are correlated. We overcome this problem in steps 2 – 4.

In the first step (item 2) the parties get to know the value of the key on key part. The next step (item 3) shows that our protocol is of the kind "all versus nothing": if the key has atypical value (having too small number of some of the symbols $0, \dots, d-1$), the parties trace out the whole state, create the error flags and proceed with step 2 for the next of k blocks. This however occurs extremely rarely due to concentration property of independent, identically distributed random variables. Hence with probability almost one, the key value is typical, and Alice and Bob proceed with the main step of the protocol (item 4).

In the fourth step they decouple the key part and the shield by sorting conditional states on the shield part: all states labelled with 0 together, up to $d-1$. The only correlations which survive between the system AB and $A'B'$ are due to the type that is how many symbols 0's, 1's up to $d-1$'s are in the value of the key on system AB .

The next step (item 5) is provided for technical reasons, as it allows for easy calculation of the rate of the protocol. In the pre-last step Alice and Bob perform a key distillation protocol on $t_{\min}(m)$ copies of the state $\sigma_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}$ which, by definition, ends up with a state close to some private state $\gamma_{A'B'A''B''}$. The state on $ABA'B'A''B''$ has now the perfect key on $A'B'$ and the partially secure key on AB about which Eve knows the type that is a number of symbols in the string of the value of this key. Fortunately, this knowledge has very low entropy, sub-linear in m , and will not affect the total rate of the protocol.

After repeating steps 2 – 6 k times (or items 2 – 3 if unsuccessful in item 3 respectively), in the last step Alice and Bob perform the Devetak-Winter protocol on the subsystems $AA'BB'$ of k such obtained states [30]. It then remains to check that the rate of the Devetak-Winter protocol reads in this case approximately $r(m, k) = k(m \log d - m h(\frac{m}{m+d-1})) + t_{\min}(m)K_D(\sigma) - o(m) - o(k)$. The first term corresponds to $m \log d$ bits of initial ideal key on AB however it is lowered by the second term $m h(\frac{m}{m+d-1})$. The latter corresponds to Eve's knowledge of the type. Indeed, there are no more than

$$\binom{m+d-1}{m} \leq 2^{mh(\frac{m}{m+d-1})} \quad (10)$$

of different types of strings of length m of symbols from

d -ary alphabet [31]. The third term $t_{\min}(m)K_D(\sigma)$ is the rate of the protocol of key distillation from $t_{\min}(m)$ copies of state σ . Hence, choosing properly value of $\delta(m)$ approaching 0 with m going to infinity (see Appendix B), we obtain that the rate of our protocol which is $\frac{1}{m}r(m, k)$ reaches asymptotically (taking $m, k \rightarrow \infty$) value $\log d + \frac{1}{d}K_D(\sigma_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{d-1})$, as claimed. $\square$

From the above theorem we have immediate important corollary which partially characterizes the set of irreducible private states:

Corollary 1. *For any irreducible private state γ of the form*

$$\frac{1}{d} \sum_{ij} |ii\rangle\langle jj| \otimes U_i \sigma U_j \quad (11)$$

there is

$$\forall \{i \in 0, \dots, d-1\} \quad K_D(\sigma_i) = 0, \quad (12)$$

where $\sigma_i = U_i \sigma U_i^\dagger$.

We note here that our protocol needs for a pdit γ_d by definition a huge number of its copies: ksd for some parameter s , s and k increasing asymptotically. It is really huge, in comparison with the fact that one can get $\log d$ of key from a *single* copy of γ_d by measuring its key part. However, it shows what can be done in general, asymptotically, which allows to study the distillable key of reducible private states.

A. Tighter bound on relative entropy of private states

It is tempting to ask if the protocol that we proposed is optimal. In what follows we will improve the bounds on relative entropy of entanglement for private states which will show to what extend performance of our protocol is not tight. So far the following bound was known [7]:

$$K_D(\gamma) \leq E_r^\infty(\gamma) \leq \log d + \frac{1}{d} \sum_i E_r^\infty(\sigma_i). \quad (13)$$

In the next theorem we present a bit tighter bound. The fact that it may be better comes from the subadditivity of E_r . The proof of it is directly inspired by the protocol from the above section.

Theorem 2. *For any pdit $\gamma_{d,d'}$ we have*

$$E_r^\infty(\gamma_{ABA'B'}) \leq \log d + \frac{1}{d} E_r^\infty(\sigma), \quad (14)$$

where $\sigma = \sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}$ and σ_i are conditional states on $A'B'$ for $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, d-1\}$.

Proof. The first part of the proof is based on Theorems 3 and 4 from [7]. For the sake of completeness we present here the crucial steps which are necessary to prove our

result. From Theorem 3 of the above-mentioned paper for the state $\gamma_{ABA'B'}^{\otimes n}$ we have $E_r(\gamma_{ABA'B'}^{\otimes n}) \leq \log d^n + \frac{1}{dn} \sum_{k=0}^{d^n-1} E_r(\rho_k)$, where $k = (i_1, \dots, i_n)$ is a multi-index with $i_l \in \{0, 1, \dots, d-1\}$ for every $l \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and $\rho_k = \sigma_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{i_n}$. This equation divided by n from the both sides can be easily rewritten as $\frac{1}{n} E_r(\gamma_{ABA'B'}^{\otimes n}) \leq \log d + \frac{1}{nd^n} \sum_{k=0}^{d^n-1} E_r(\rho_k)$, where the left-hand-side for $n \rightarrow \infty$ approaches $E_r^\infty(\gamma_{ABA'B'})$. First of all, let us recall that $E_r(\rho_k) = E_r(\rho_{k'})$ which has the same numbers of occurrence of symbols from the set $\{0, \dots, d-1\}$, i.e. when $k = k'$. Additionally, considering only those ρ_k for which k is δ -strongly typical ($\delta > 0$) we have

$$\forall a \in \{0, \dots, d-1\} \quad \left| \frac{a(k)}{n} - \frac{1}{d} \right| < \delta, \quad (15)$$

where $a(k)$ denotes frequency of a symbol a in a sequence k . The set of such k we denote as $\mathcal{ST}_\delta^n$. Rewriting $\sum_k E_r(\rho_k)$ over $k \in \mathcal{ST}_\delta^n$ and $k \notin \mathcal{ST}_\delta^n$ due to [7] we have

$$\frac{1}{nd^n} \sum_{k=1}^{d^n-1} E_r(\rho_k) \leq \frac{1}{nd^n} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{ST}_\delta^n} E_r(\rho_k) + \epsilon \log d, \quad (16)$$

where $\epsilon > 0$. Now, our goal is to improve the bound on $E_r(\rho_k) = E_r(\sigma_0^{\otimes m_0} \otimes \sigma_1^{\otimes m_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}^{\otimes m_{d-1}})$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$, where σ_i are conditional states on $A'B'$. Defining $m \equiv \min\{m_0, m_1, \dots, m_{d-1}\}$ we can make the following observation using the fact on strong typicality (15)

$$\forall i \in \{0, 1, \dots, d-1\} \quad \left| \frac{m_i}{n} - \frac{1}{d} \right| < \delta \wedge \left| \frac{m}{n} - \frac{1}{d} \right| < \delta. \quad (17)$$

By the triangle inequality we have

$$\left| \frac{m}{n} - \frac{m_i}{n} \right| \leq \left| \frac{m}{n} - \frac{1}{d} \right| + \left| \frac{1}{d} - \frac{m_i}{n} \right| < 2\delta. \quad (18)$$

Using the definition of the parameter m and triangle inequality we are able to rewrite the first term on the RHS of (16) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{nd^n} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{ST}_\delta^n} E_r(\sigma_0^{\otimes m_0} \otimes \sigma_1^{\otimes m_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}^{\otimes m_{d-1}}) \\ & \leq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{ST}_\delta^n} \frac{m}{nd^n} E_r(\sigma^{\otimes m}) + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{ST}_\delta^n} \frac{\tilde{m}_0}{nd^n} \frac{1}{\tilde{m}_0} E_r(\sigma_0^{\otimes \tilde{m}_0}) \\ & + \dots + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{ST}_\delta^n} \frac{\tilde{m}_{d-1}}{nd^n} \frac{1}{\tilde{m}_{d-1}} E_r(\sigma_{d-1}^{\otimes \tilde{m}_{d-1}}), \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where $\sigma = (\sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{d-1})^{\otimes m}$ and $\forall i \tilde{m}_i \equiv m_i - m$. The first term on the RHS of (19) by the condition given by (15) and the definition of the regularized relative entropy we get $(\frac{1}{d} + \delta)(1 - \delta)E_r^\infty(\sigma)$, which approaches $\frac{1}{d}E_r^\infty(\sigma)$, since δ can be arbitrarily small. Now, we have

to bound the rest of terms (the tail) in (19). To do so, we use the definition of the relative entropy of entanglement E_r and the fact that $\mathbf{1}/d \in \mathcal{SEP}$:

$$\forall \sigma \quad E_r(\sigma) \equiv \inf_{\omega \in \mathcal{SEP}} D(\sigma|\omega) \leq D\left(\sigma \middle| \frac{\mathbf{1}}{d}\right), \quad (20)$$

where $D(\cdot|\cdot)$ denotes the relative entropy. Thanks to this $D(\sigma|\frac{\mathbf{1}}{d}) = -\text{Tr} \sigma \log \sigma - \text{Tr} \sigma \log(\mathbf{1}/d) = \log d - S(\sigma) \leq \log d$, since $\forall \sigma S(\sigma) \geq 0$, where $S(\cdot)$ is the von Neumann entropy. Because of that, and the subadditivity of E_r we can bound every term from the tail in (19) as $(1/\tilde{m}_i)E_r(\sigma^{\otimes \tilde{m}_i}) \leq E_r(\sigma) \leq \log d_i$. Finally, we are in the position to bound the tail in (19), namely by (18) and by above considerations the desired bound is of the form $2\delta(1 - \delta) \sum_i \log d_i$. Now since the sum $\sum_i \log d_i$ is constant and δ can be arbitrarily small we conclude that the tail in (19) vanishes. $\square$

III. PROPERTIES OF THE SET OF IRREDUCIBLE PRIVATE STATES

Recall that by $\mathcal{IR}_{d,d'}$ we denote the set of irreducible private states with the dimension of key $d \otimes d$ and that of shield $d' \otimes d'$. Not to overload notation, we will omit the dimensions writing $\mathcal{IR}$ if some fact holds for any fixed dimensions or the dimensions are known from the context. It is natural to imagine that the key obtained from two different states from $\mathcal{IR}$ is no more than the sum of the keys from each of them. In what follows we will prove this for certain subsets of $\mathcal{IR}$. We begin with some simple observation.

Observation 1. *Let M_1 and M_2 be two measures of entanglement such that M_1 is superadditive and M_2 is subadditive. Then $M_1 \leq M_2$ implies that the set $\mathcal{S} \equiv \{\rho : M_1(\rho) = M_2(\rho)\}$ is closed under the tensor product.*

Proof. It amounts to observe that from the superadditivity of M_1 there is

$$M_1(\rho_1) + M_1(\rho_2) \leq M_1(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2) \quad (21)$$

for any two states ρ_i from $\mathcal{S}$. Then the LHS is bounded by $M_2(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2)$. By the subadditivity of M_2 we have then:

$$M_2(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2) \leq M_2(\rho_1) + M_2(\rho_2) \quad (22)$$

and since states ρ_i are from $\mathcal{S}$ the RHS equals to $M_1(\rho_1) + M_1(\rho_2)$ closing the chain of inequalities and through (21) proves $M_1(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2) = M_2(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2)$, showing that $\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ as we claimed. $\square$

We are now going to show an important example where the above observation applies. We have an immediate corollary:

Corollary 2. *The following sets are closed under the tensor product.*

$$\mathcal{R} \equiv \{\rho : K_D(\rho) = E_r(\rho)\}, \quad (23)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_\infty \equiv \{\rho : K_D(\rho) = E_r^\infty(\rho)\}, \quad (24)$$

$$\mathcal{I} \equiv \{\rho : K_D(\rho) = I_{sq}(\rho)\}, \quad (25)$$

where E_r is the relative entropy of entanglement, K_D is the distillable key, and I_{sq} is the squashed entanglement measure.

Proof. For the proof it amounts to observe that K_D is superadditive, E_r is subadditive and I_{sq} is additive [32], while the latter two are bounds on K_D [1, 5, 7, 32].

Now let us note, that the sets $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{R}_\infty$ have the following subsets:

$$\mathcal{R}_{ir} \equiv \mathcal{IR} \cap \mathcal{R}, \quad (26)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_{ir,\infty} \equiv \mathcal{IR} \cap \mathcal{R}_\infty, \quad (27)$$

$$\mathcal{I}_{ir} \equiv \mathcal{IR} \cap \mathcal{I} \quad (28)$$

with some special properties. Because the tensor product of two private states is again a private state (up to a local unitary transformation [24]), by the above corollary as an immediate consequence we have that both the $\mathcal{R}_{ir}$, $\mathcal{R}_{ir,\infty}$ and $\mathcal{I}$ are closed under the tensor product. $\square$

Moreover, the above sets are obviously non-empty, and have a non-empty intersections. Indeed, let us fix dimensions and consider: $\mathcal{R}_{ir}(d, d') = \mathcal{IR}_{d,d'} \cap \mathcal{R}(d, d')$, $\mathcal{R}_{ir,\infty} = \mathcal{IR}_{d,d'} \cap \mathcal{R}_\infty(d, d')$ and $\mathcal{I}_{ir}(d, d') = \mathcal{IR}_{d,d'} \cap \mathcal{I}(d, d')$.

$$|\psi_+\rangle \otimes \sigma'_d \in \mathcal{R}_{ir}(d, d') \cap \mathcal{R}_{ir,\infty}(d, d') \cap \mathcal{I}_{ir}(d, d') \quad (29)$$

for any dimension d' , where $|\psi_+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_i |ii\rangle$, that is a maximally entangled state and σ'_d is an arbitrary d'^2 -dimensional separable state. In other words, all three sets have in their mutual intersection the set of basic private state with a separable shield.

Let us note here, that there is $\mathcal{R}_{ir}(2, d') \neq \mathcal{I}_{ir}(2, d')$ for any dimension d' . This is because the class of states "flower state" γ_f which are pbits with d dimensional shield satisfy $E_r(\gamma_f) = 1$ but $I_{sq}(\gamma_f) = 1 + \frac{\log d}{2}$ [33].

A. Irreducible private states vs existence of bound key states

We say that a quantum state ρ has the bound distillable key if $K_D(\rho) = 0$ and ρ is entangled. It is a widely open problem if such states exist. If so, entanglement and secrecy would be different. We are far from solving it; we rather connect it to the irreducible private states. More precisely, if there are no bound key states, we have the full characterization of the set $\mathcal{IR}$:

Clearly, we have $\mathcal{R}_{ir} \subseteq \mathcal{IR}$. We consider now the condition under which the converse inclusion holds.

Proposition 1. *$\mathcal{IR} \neq \mathcal{R}_{ir}$ if and only if there exists a state with the bound key. The same holds for the set $\mathcal{R}_{ir,\infty}$ in place of $\mathcal{R}_{ir}$.*

Proof. We have by the definition $\mathcal{R}_{ir} \subseteq \mathcal{IR}$. We show that $\mathcal{IR} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{ir}$ unless a bound key state exists. The proof goes by contradiction. Suppose there exists $\gamma_0 \in \mathcal{IR} \setminus \mathcal{R}_{ir}$. We will show that it implies existence of bound key states. Let it have the form $\gamma = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i,j=0}^{d-1} |ii\rangle\langle jj| \otimes U_i \sigma U_j^\dagger$ and $\sigma_j \equiv U_j \sigma U_j^\dagger$. For the state γ by Theorem 1 we have

$$K_D(\gamma) \geq \log d + \frac{1}{d} K_D(\sigma_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}), \quad (30)$$

since the protocol from Theorem 1 may be suboptimal.

Since γ is from $\mathcal{IR}$, we have $K_D(\gamma) = \log d$ which proves $K_D(\sigma_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}) = 0$. By monotonicity of K_D this proves, that for all i we have $K_D(\sigma_i) = 0$, as σ_i can be obtained from $\sigma_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}$ by LOCC.

On the other hand, γ does not belong to $\mathcal{R}_{ir}$, that is $K_D(\gamma) \neq E_r(\gamma)$. More precisely $\log d < E_r(\gamma)$, since $K_D \leq E_r$ in general. Due to subadditivity of E_r via Theorem 2, there is

$$\log d < E_r(\gamma) \leq \log d + \frac{1}{d} E_r(\sigma_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}) \quad (31)$$

and since $E_r(\gamma) > \log d$, we have by the above the inequality that

$$E_r(\sigma_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}) > 0. \quad (32)$$

From the faithfulness of the relative entropy of entanglement [34] it follows that at least one σ_i has to be entangled. Otherwise, if all σ_i were separable, it would mean, that the product $\sigma_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}$ is also separable and hence $E_r(\sigma_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}) = 0$. Recall however, that as we argued above, $K_D(\sigma_{i_0}) = 0$ therefore σ_i has the bound key. Thus if there are no bound key states, we have $\mathcal{IR} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{ir}$ which proves $\mathcal{IR} = \mathcal{R}_{ir}$ under no key bound states condition as claimed. $\square$

We have then immediate corollary characterizing the set $\mathcal{IR}$ in four qubits. By $\mathcal{SEP}$ we will mean the set of separable states.

Corollary 3. *The set of irreducible private bits $\mathcal{IR}_{d,2}$ consists of the strictly irreducible pdits, that is those states $\gamma_d = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i,j=0}^{d-1} |ii\rangle\langle jj| \otimes U_i \sigma U_j^\dagger$ for which there is:*

$$U_0 \sigma U_0^\dagger, \dots, U_{d-1} \sigma U_{d-1}^\dagger \in \mathcal{SEP}. \quad (33)$$

Moreover, for $d = 2$ with $X = U_0 \sigma U_1^\dagger$, there is $E_N(\gamma_2) = \log(1 + \|X^\Gamma\|_1)$ where Γ denotes the partial transposition and E_N is the log-negativity entanglement measure.

Proof. The first part is a direct consequence of Proposition 1 and the fact that in $2 \otimes 2$ there are no bound key states. Indeed, any state in $2 \otimes 2$ which is entangled, has non-zero distillable entanglement [35]. The second part follows from the application of Lemma 3 of [7], as $\sqrt{X X^\dagger}$ and $\sqrt{X^\dagger X}$ are separable, hence have the positive partial transposition and this lemma applies. $\square$

The above corollary in particular holds for the strictly irreducible pbits, considered in [24]. We note that the matrix from (3) implies that the diagonal blocks of the matrix of a private bit from $\mathcal{IR}_{2,2}$ are separable.

Remark 1. Let us note, that if the analogue proposition of 1 for some measure M and there was a state $\gamma \in \mathcal{R}_M \setminus \mathcal{R}_{ir}$ then there exists a bound key state. Although we know that $\mathcal{I}_{ir} \neq \mathcal{R}_{ir}$, in the case of I_{sq} the analogue of Proposition 1 is not true in general as the analogue of the bound (31) does not hold e.g. for the mentioned flower state γ_f .

To ensure that the state σ from (33) is separable after the action of an arbitrary unitary operations U_0, U_1 is enough to take σ from the set of the absolutely separable states $\mathcal{ASEP}$ [36, 37]. Such an idea of the construction was proposed in [23], but without an explicit presentation of allowed classes of states. Here we construct an explicit class of above mentioned states in qubit-qubit case and we show by counterexample, that such class does not saturate all possible choices. The problem of the absolute separability or the separability from the spectrum [38–40] asks for a characterization of the states $\rho \in \mathcal{C}^d \otimes \mathcal{C}^d$, such that $U\rho U^\dagger$ is separable for all unitary matrices U . We know that such full characterization was done for the qubit-qubit [39] case and then it was generalized for the qubit-qudit case [40]. Here we restrict ourselves to the case of the two qubits by recalling the following theorem from the mentioned papers:

Theorem 3. Consider the state $\rho \in \mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^2$. Let $\text{spec}^\downarrow(\rho) = \{\lambda_i : i = 1, \dots, 4\}$ be a set of eigenvalues of ρ in a non-increasing order, then the state is absolutely separable if and only if its eigenvalues satisfy

$$\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_3 + 2\sqrt{\lambda_2\lambda_4}. \quad (34)$$

We see that thanks to (3) by putting states σ from (3) satisfying (34) we always get an irreducible pbit. Of course we can find a state $\sigma \notin \mathcal{ASEP}$ and nonlocal twisting operations for which conditions in (33) are fulfilled. We illustrate this by the following example:

Example 1. Let us consider a separable state

$$\sigma = \frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \cdot & \cdot & 1 \\ \cdot & 1 & 1 & \cdot \\ \cdot & 1 & 1 & \cdot \\ 1 & \cdot & \cdot & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (35)$$

which is not absolutely separable, since the condition (34) does not hold. This means that there exists a unitary transformation U for which $U\sigma U^\dagger$ is entangled, so $\sigma^\Gamma = (U\rho U^\dagger)^\Gamma \not\geq 0$, where Γ denotes the operation of the partial transposition with respect to one of the subsystems. On the other hand, there exist non-local unitary operations V , such that condition $\sigma^\Gamma = (V\sigma V^\dagger)^\Gamma \geq 0$ holds - this means that the state $V\sigma V^\dagger$ is separable. Here

we provide the family of such operations V

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot \\ s & -c & \cdot & \cdot \\ c & s & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (36)$$

where $c = \cos(\theta)$ and $s = \sin(\theta)$ for $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$. It is easy to see that $\sigma^\Gamma = (V\sigma V^\dagger)^\Gamma \geq 0$, which means that $V\sigma V^\dagger \in \mathcal{SEP}$. The unitary transformation V is indeed non-local, since after an action on the separable state

$$\tilde{\sigma} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (37)$$

we get $(V\tilde{\sigma}V^\dagger)^\Gamma \not\geq 0$.

IV. NON-STRICTLY IRREDUCIBLE PRIVATE STATES AND QUANTUM KEY REPEATERS

In this section we show a possible way of application of our results to the problem of quantum key repeaters. The problem is stated as follows: Alice and Charlie share $\rho^{\otimes n}$ as well as Charlie and Bob share $\rho^{\otimes n}$ for some large enough n . The question is if there exists an LOCC protocol which ends up in non-negligible amount of key shared by Alice and Bob, which is a generalization of the repeater scenario [20] to swapping of the key [19]. More precisely it is shown there, that although this can be clearly achieved on a singlet state, it is hardly to be achieved on certain approximate private states which remain positive under the partial transposition. This result has been extended in [24] to hold for states and protocols which first distill *strictly irreducible* private states and then try to perform some key-swapping protocol unless the latter private states have large distillable entanglement. More precisely it is shown there that:

$$\hat{R}(\rho \otimes \tilde{\rho}) \leq E_D(\rho \otimes \tilde{\rho}), \quad (38)$$

where $\hat{R}$ (see Appendix C) is the rate of key between Alice and Bob after an LOCC protocol between three parties (and tracing out then Charlie's system), where they first distill $\langle \gamma \rangle$, while E_D denotes the *distillable entanglement* measure. In particular it implies that:

$$R(\gamma \otimes \gamma) \leq E_D(\gamma \otimes \gamma), \quad (39)$$

where R is the original key repeater rate from [19], for γ being strictly irreducible private states.

In what follows we will show that the key-attacked state of *any* irreducible private state is key-undistillable. We then observe that in order to obtain the generalization of (39) to *all* irreducible private state it is enough that the key-undistillable states are far enough from private states in the trace norm distance. This fact is true

for the subset of key-undistillable states which are the *separable* states. We provide a lower bound on the distance between the set of key-undistillable states $\mathcal{Z}$ and the set of private states, which is of independent interest, yet too weak to give the final generalization result.

In what follows, the state

$$\hat{\gamma} \equiv \frac{1}{d} \sum_{ij} |ii\rangle\langle ii| \otimes U_i \sigma U_i^\dagger \quad (40)$$

denotes the key-attacked state of a private state γ . As announced, we begin with the following observation: We examine now the aforementioned (39) result of [24], to show what is still missing to extend it to *all* irreducible private states. First, let us notice that it is shown there, that:

$$E_D(\gamma \otimes \gamma) \geq D_{AB:C}(\gamma^{\otimes n} \otimes \gamma^{\otimes n} || \hat{\gamma}^{\otimes n} \otimes \hat{\gamma}^{\otimes n}), \quad (41)$$

where $D_{AB:C}$ is the LOCC-measured relative entropy distance [34].

Now, if γ is strictly irreducible, then the key-attacked state is separable in the $A : B$ cut, and hence so is the output of any repeater protocol on ABC . This very statement we cannot say for *any*, not necessarily strictly irreducible state. It is however easy to notice, due to Observation 2 which we prove in the next section, that the output of any repeater protocol on $\hat{\gamma}^{\otimes n} \otimes \hat{\gamma}^{\otimes n}$ is a key-undistillable state. Indeed, the key repeater protocol is a LOCC map, which cannot create the key between Alice and Charlie and Bob together if there was no key in the initial state as it was for $\hat{\gamma}^{\otimes n}$ as we prove in Observation 2. Thus, we transform the problem to study key-undistillable states instead of separable states for the rest of the proof.

Following further the proof of [24], we observe that it is sufficient for their result, that

$$\|\rho - \gamma_d\|_1 \geq 1 - \frac{1}{d} \quad (42)$$

for any separable state any private γ with the $d \otimes d$ key part, which is known to be true [23]. In our case, we would like to prove the above, but for ρ being key-undistillable, which possibly may not be separable. In the next section we will prove first the lower bound on the latter distance, yet much weaker than the above inequality, hence we can not conclude yet, that (39) holds for all irreducible private states.

V. PROPERTIES OF THE KEY-UNDISTILLABLE STATES

In this section we show that the key-attacked state of an irreducible private state is key-undistillable. We then show a lower bound on the trace distance between the key-undistillable and private states.

Observation 2. *The key-attacked state $\hat{\gamma}$ of an irreducible private state γ is key-undistillable. The same holds for $\hat{\gamma}^{\otimes n}$ for $n \geq 2$.*

Proof. $K_D(\gamma) = \log d$ implies via Theorem 1, that $K_D(\sigma_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}) \equiv K_D(\sigma) = 0$. However the state $\hat{\gamma}$ can be obtained from σ via an LOCC operation. Indeed, attaching a state $\rho_a = \frac{1}{d} \sum_i |ii\rangle\langle ii|$ is LOCC as the latter state is separable. Then making the control-partial trace over all but the i -th state σ_i from σ is an another bi-local LOCC operation. The partial trace over the ancillary state leaves us with $\hat{\gamma}$. Since the LOCC operation on the key-undistillable state leaves it key-undistillable, for $n = 1$ the assertion follows. The proof for $n > 1$ is analogous: just with $\rho_a^{\otimes n}$ in the place of ρ_a . $\square$

Before we proceed we need more definitions and facts to invoke. We define an operation of mapping a bipartite state on systems AB to a classical-classical-quantum (ccq) state on systems ABE as follows [23]:

Definition 9. *For a bipartite state $\rho_{ABA'B'}$ its ccq state with respect to system AB and basis $\mathcal{B} = \{|e_i\rangle \otimes |f_j\rangle\}$ is the state*

$$(\rho)_{ccq} \equiv \text{Tr}_{A'B'} \left(\sum_{ij} P_i \otimes Q_j \otimes \mathbf{1}_E |\psi_\rho\rangle\langle\psi_\rho| P_i \otimes Q_j \otimes \mathbf{1}_E \right), \quad (43)$$

where $P_i \equiv |e_i\rangle\langle e_i| \otimes \mathbf{1}_{A'B'}$ and $Q_j = |f_j\rangle\langle f_j| \otimes \mathbf{1}_{A'B'}$, while $|\psi_\rho\rangle$ is a purification of the state ρ_{AB} to system E . In case when the system $A'B'$ is absent, we say that $(\rho)_{ccq}$ is a ccq state of ρ with respect to basis $\mathcal{B}$.

Let us note here, that such defined ccq state is not unique, however any two ccq states of ρ can differ only by an isometry on system E , hence the secure content of them is the same, as such operation is at hand of Eve, and is reversible. In particular we may fix for the rest of our considerations that we use the standard purification:

$$\sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|_{AB} \mapsto \sum_i \sqrt{p_i} |\psi_i\rangle_{AB} \otimes |i\rangle_E. \quad (44)$$

An important fact for what follows is that the twisting with control basis $\mathcal{B} = \{|e_i\rangle \otimes |f_j\rangle\}$ (that is unitary $U = \sum_{ij} |e_i\rangle\langle e_i| \otimes |f_j\rangle\langle f_j|_{AB} \otimes U_{A'B'}^{(e_i, f_j)}$) does not change the ccq state with respect to system AB and basis $\mathcal{B}$ of a given state $\rho_{ABA'B'}$ ([7], see also theorem 3.3 of [23]). Formally we have:

$$(U \rho_{ABA'B'} U^\dagger)_{ccq} = (\rho_{ABA'B'})_{ccq}. \quad (45)$$

We note now that the rate of the one-way Devetak-Winter protocol on some ccq state ρ which we invoke in Theorem 1 reads:

$$C_{DW}(\rho_{ccq}) \equiv I(A : B)_{\rho_{ccq}} - I(A : E)_{\rho_{ccq}}, \quad (46)$$

where $I(X : Y)_\rho$ is the (quantum) mutual information of a state of X, Y subsystem of the state ρ_{ccq} . For the

more formal definition of C_{DW} (the classical distillable key) we refer to Appendix A.

Finally let us recall the notion of privacy squeezed state [7]. It involves the operation of privacy squeezing. Privacy squeezing of ρ according to basis $\{|e_i\rangle \otimes |f_j\rangle\}$ is composition of (i) operation of the form $U = \sum_{ij} |e_i\rangle \langle e_i|_{AB} \otimes |f_j\rangle \langle f_j| \otimes U_{A'B'}^{(e_i, f_j)}$ with certain special $U_{A'B'}^{(e_i, f_j)}$ defined by the state ρ and subsequently (ii) tracing out the subsystem $A'B'$. The result of this operation is called the *privacy squeezed state* of ρ .

We are ready now for an attempt to consider a general question, interesting on its own: *how far are the key-undistillable states from the private states?* We base on the proof of a lower bound on distillable key given in [41] (see [23] for more elaborative explanation):

Theorem 4. [23, 41] *For any bipartite state ρ_{AB} there is:*

$$K_D(\rho_{AB}) \geq C_{DW}((\rho_{psq})_{ccq}), \quad (47)$$

where ρ_{psq} is the privacy squeezed state of the state ρ .

We will now generalize the above theorem to obtain the *necessary condition of key-undistillability*, which in fact can be viewed as non-one-way-key-distillability. In what follows by $\mathcal{Z}$ we will denote the set of key-undistillable states, where the dimension is assumed to be understood from the context.

Theorem 5. *For any key-undistillable state $\rho \in \mathcal{Z}$, and for any unitary transformations U_1 and U_2 which choose the subsystems so that $U_1 \otimes U_2 \rho U_1^\dagger \otimes U_2^\dagger =: \rho_{ABA'B'}$, as well as any unitary transformation of the form $U = \sum_{ij} |ij\rangle \langle ij|_{AB} \otimes U_{A'B'}^{(ij)}$ there is:*

$$C_{DW}((\text{Tr}_{A'B'} U \rho U^\dagger)_{ccq}) \leq 0, \quad (48)$$

where the ccq state is w.r.t. to the computational basis $\{|ij\rangle\}$.

Proof. Let us set $U_1 \otimes U_2$ arbitrarily. We have a chain of (in)equalities, which we explain below.

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq C_{DW}((U_1 \otimes U_2 \rho U_1^\dagger \otimes U_2^\dagger)_{ccq}) \\ &= C_{DW}((U U_1 \otimes U_2 \rho U_1^\dagger \otimes U_2^\dagger U^\dagger)_{ccq}) \\ &\equiv C_{DW}((\rho')_{ccq}) \geq C_{DW}((\text{Tr}_{A'B'} \rho')_{ccq}). \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

The first inequality comes from the fact that composition of $U_1 \otimes U_2$ and the Devetak-Winter protocol applied to subsystem of the state $U_1 \otimes U_2^\dagger \rho U_1 \otimes U_2^\dagger$ is a particular key-distillation protocol, which on a key-undistillable state can not achieve a positive rate (in fact C_{DW} as one can see in Eq. (46) can be negative). The ccq state considered there is with respect to subsystem AB and computational basis, so as in the next equality. This equality is due to the aforementioned fact that unitary transformation $U^\dagger$ does not change the ccq state (w.r.t. to subsystem AB

and control-basis of U) of the state $U_1 \otimes U_2^\dagger \rho U_1 \otimes U_2^\dagger$ (see Theorem 3.3 [23]). Now the partial trace of the subsystem $A'B'$ can not increase the key, so that the final inequality holds, and the assertion follows. $\square$

The above theorem will allow us to prove a lower bound on distance between key-undistillable states and private states, improving the result of [23] where a dual fact is proved, namely that the states closer to private bits by $\delta < 0.001$ are key distillable.

Theorem 6. *For any state which has $K_D(\rho) = 0$, and any private state γ with the $d \otimes d$ dimensional key-part:*

$$\|\rho - \gamma\|_1 \geq z(d) \quad (50)$$

with

$$z(d) = \inf_{1 \geq \epsilon \geq 0} \left\{ \epsilon : \epsilon \geq \frac{1}{6} - \frac{2\eta(\epsilon)}{3 \log d} \right\}, \quad (51)$$

where $\eta(x) = -x \log x$.

With a bit of self criticism let us note that the bound is actually small, reaching asymptotically $\lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} z(d) = 1/6 = 0.1(6)$, although perhaps our considerations can be improved by more careful approach. The bound however is non-trivial even for the smallest $d = 2$, with the value 0.041.

Before showing the proof, let us mention an easy corollary, where by $\mathcal{Z}$ we denote the set of key-undistillable states.

Corollary 4. *For any private state γ_d , there is:*

$$\inf_{\Lambda \in \text{LOCC}} \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{Z}} \|\Lambda(\rho) - \gamma_d\|_1 \geq \frac{1}{6} - \frac{2}{3 \log d}. \quad (52)$$

The state $\Lambda(\rho)$ and γ_d in the above are assumed to be properly embedded so that their dimensions are compatible.

Proof. The statement of corollary follows from the fact that the set of key-undistillable states is closed under LOCC operations. We also use the fact that $\eta(x) \leq h(x)$ with h being the binary Shannon entropy function and that binary Shannon entropy is less than 1. $\square$

Now we are in the position to prove theorem 6.

Proof. We will use the fact, that C_{DW} is asymptotic continuous. Clearly for the singlet state it reads $\log d$ and for the state emerging from the key-undistillable state via control-unitary and the partial trace, must be zero through Theorem 5. This in turn implies the bound on the distance between states. Let us note here, that it is actually rather uncommon usage of the asymptotic continuity, aiming at the proof that states must be far as continuous faction differs on them enough, rather than finding evaluation of functions close on some close states.

We first invoke the asymptotic continuity of the entropy and the conditional entropy function [42, 43]. As

long as the states satisfy $\|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}$ (each on the dimension d), we have:

$$|S(\rho_1) - S(\rho_2)| \leq \|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1 \log d + \eta(\|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1). \quad (53)$$

Let us fix $0 < \epsilon < 1$, and note, that γ by the definition is of the form $U|\Psi_+\rangle\langle\Psi_+| \otimes \sigma_{A'B'}U^\dagger$ for $U = \sum_{ij} |ij\rangle\langle ij| \otimes U_{A'B'}^{(ij)}$, some state σ on $A'B'$ and $|\Psi_+\rangle\langle\Psi_+| = \sum_{ij} \frac{1}{d} |ii\rangle\langle jj|$ the singlet state. Let us note here, that we assumed that the control basis of twisting U is the computational basis, since the proof for other product basis $\{|e_i\rangle \otimes |f_i\rangle\}$ is analogous.

We first note that due to the monotonicity of operation under measurements, for an arbitrary state ρ and the private state γ there is:

$$\epsilon = \|\gamma - \rho\|_1 \geq \left\| |\Psi_+\rangle\langle\Psi_+| - \text{Tr}_{A'B'} U^\dagger \rho U \right\|_1, \quad (54)$$

where $\rho' := \text{Tr}_{A'B'} U^\dagger \rho U$ the result of "untwisting" $U^\dagger$ and the partial trace on ρ .

As announced, we use now the fact that $C_{DW}(|\Psi_+\rangle\langle\Psi_+|_{ccq}) = \log d$ and $C_{DW}((\rho')_{ccq}) \leq 0$ due to Theorem 5, as $K_D(\rho) = 0$. Hence, unless $\epsilon > 1$, throughout asymptotic continuity of entropic functions, we have the following chain of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \log d &\leq |C_{DW}(|\Psi_+\rangle\langle\Psi_+|_{ccq}) - C_{DW}((\rho')_{ccq})| \\ &\leq |\log d - S(\tilde{\rho}_A)| + |\log d - S(\tilde{\rho}_B)| \\ &\quad + |\log d - S(\tilde{\rho}_{AB})| + I(A : E)_{\tilde{\rho}}, \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

where $\tilde{\rho} = (\rho')_{ccq}$ and we consider particular subsystems of $\tilde{\rho}$. Following [23] we now observe, that $I(A : E)_{\rho'_{ccq}} \leq S(A : B)_{\rho'}$. Since ρ' is close to the singlet state which is pure it satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} S(A : B)_{\rho'} &\leq \left\| |\Psi_+\rangle\langle\Psi_+| - \rho' \right\|_1 \log d^2 \\ &\quad + \eta(\left\| |\Psi_+\rangle\langle\Psi_+| - \rho' \right\|_1). \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

Altogether, from (55) and the above inequality, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \log d &\leq \epsilon 2(\log d + \eta(\epsilon)) + 2(\epsilon \log d^2 + \eta(\epsilon)) \\ &= 6\epsilon \log d + 4\eta(\epsilon) \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

which implies

$$\epsilon \geq \frac{1}{6} - \frac{2\eta(\epsilon)}{3 \log d}, \quad (58)$$

as claimed. $\square$

A. Application to no-key swapping

Although the bound from theorem 6 is too weak to imply bound on quantum key repeaters, it implies non-key swapping of them in case of single copy using only a general notion of key-undistillable states instead of separable

ones. We recall first that :

$$\begin{aligned} &K_{A \leftrightarrow B \leftrightarrow C}^{\text{single copy}}(\rho_{AC_A} \otimes \tilde{\rho}_{BC_B}) = \\ &\inf_{\epsilon > 0} \sup_{\Lambda \in \text{LOCC}} \{ \log d : \|\text{Tr}_C \Lambda(\rho_{AC_A} \otimes \tilde{\rho}_{BC_B}) - \gamma_d\|_1 \leq \epsilon \}. \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

We then have the following corollary, which is based on Lemma 1 of [19].

Corollary 5. *The states ρ_{AC_A} and $\tilde{\rho}_{BC_B}$ which satisfy the following bound:*

$$\left\| (\rho_{AC_A} \otimes \tilde{\rho}_{BC_B})^\Gamma - (\sigma_{AC_A} \otimes \tilde{\sigma}_{BC_B})^\Gamma \right\|_1 < z(d), \quad (60)$$

where states σ_{AC_A} and $\tilde{\sigma}_{BC_B}$ are key-undistillable, can not be swapped by a single-copy quantum key repeater, i.e. $K_{A \leftrightarrow B \leftrightarrow C}^{\text{single copy}}(\rho_{AC_A} \otimes \tilde{\rho}_{BC_B}) = 0$.

Proof. Let us fix $\epsilon > 0$ and let an LOCC map Λ_{ACB} on systems $AC_A CB_B$ produce on the input state $\sigma_{AC_A} \otimes \sigma_{CB_B}$ a state $\hat{\rho}$ close by ϵ to some private state $\tilde{\gamma}$:

$$\|\hat{\rho} - \tilde{\gamma}\|_1 \leq \epsilon. \quad (61)$$

In what follows we will show, that ϵ can not be arbitrarily small.

We first observe, that Lemma 1 of Supplemental Material of [19] holds for arbitrary states σ_{AC_A} and σ_{BC_B} , not only separable, which provides the fact that:

$$\left\| (\rho_{AC_A} \otimes \tilde{\rho}_{BC_B})^\Gamma - (\sigma_{AC_A} \otimes \tilde{\sigma}_{BC_B})^\Gamma \right\|_1 \geq \|\hat{\rho} - \hat{\sigma}\|_1 \quad (62)$$

where $\hat{\rho} = \text{Tr}_{C_A C_B}(\Lambda_{ABC}(\rho_{AC_A} \otimes \tilde{\rho}_{BC_B}))$ and $\hat{\sigma} = \text{Tr}_{C_A C_B}(\Lambda_{ABC}(\sigma_{AC_A} \otimes \tilde{\sigma}_{BC_B}))$. σ_{AC_A} and $\tilde{\sigma}_{BC_B}$ are key-undistillable, the output state $\hat{\sigma}$ of an LOCC map is also key-undistillable. Let us define $\eta > 0$ via:

$$\left\| (\rho_{AC_A} \otimes \tilde{\rho}_{BC_B})^\Gamma - (\sigma_{AC_A} \otimes \tilde{\sigma}_{BC_B})^\Gamma \right\|_1 = z(d) - \eta. \quad (63)$$

which is true due to assumptions. Now, via bound (62) we have:

$$\|\hat{\rho} - \hat{\sigma}\|_1 \leq z(d) - \eta. \quad (64)$$

Via the triangle inequality we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\gamma} - \hat{\sigma}\|_1 &\leq \|\tilde{\gamma} - \hat{\rho}\|_1 + \|\hat{\rho} - \hat{\sigma}\|_1 \\ &\leq \epsilon + z(d) - \eta, \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where we used Eq. (61) to bound the first term and Eq. (64) to bound the second term. However, due to Theorem 6 we know that $\|\tilde{\gamma} - \hat{\sigma}\|_1 \geq z(d)$. We then see, that

$$\epsilon \geq \eta > 0, \quad (66)$$

hence there does not exist an LOCC map which produces output closer to a private state than $\eta > 0$. This implies $K_{A \leftrightarrow B \leftrightarrow C}^{\text{single copy}}(\rho_{AC_A} \otimes \tilde{\rho}_{BC_B}) = 0$ as claimed. $\square$

For a pbit $\gamma_{2,d'}$, the above corollary strengthens the proof of one of the results of [19] presented in Section "Example: pbit with $X = \text{SWAP}$ " of Supplemental Material. Namely we can prove that a pbit with $X = \text{SWAP}$, is not single copy repeatable, if only $2(1 + \frac{1}{d'})^{\frac{1}{d'}} < 0.041$, that is for $d' > 50$. The proof is stronger in that we do not use the fact that the private state under consideration is strictly irreducible. Indeed, as we will see, the result can be derived solely from the fact, that the latter state is irreducible.

Full argument is as follows. Irreducibility of γ implies that its key-attacked state $\hat{\gamma}$ is key-undistillable via the Observation 2, hence one of the assumptions of the Corollary 5 is satisfied. We have then:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\gamma^{\otimes 2})^\Gamma - (\hat{\gamma}^{\otimes 2})^\Gamma\|_1 \\ & \leq 2 \max\{\|\gamma^\Gamma\|_1, \|\hat{\gamma}^\Gamma\|_1\} \|\gamma^\Gamma - \hat{\gamma}^\Gamma\|_1 \\ & \leq 2 \|\gamma^\Gamma\|_1 \|\gamma^\Gamma - \hat{\gamma}^\Gamma\|_1 = 2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{d'}\right) \frac{1}{d'}, \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

where the first inequality comes from Eq. 6.8 of [23], second from the fact that the key-attacked state comes from γ via a LOCC measurement, hence its negativity can not be greater than that of γ . Finally we use the fact that the pbit with $X = \text{SWAP}$ is close to its key-attacked state by $\frac{1}{d'}$ in the trace norm. We then see that for $d' > 50$ the RHS of the above is lower than 0.041 so the second assumption of the Corollary 5 applies, and we are done.

VI. APPROXIMATE IRREDUCIBLE PRIVATE STATES

We note that there is a natural way to define approximate irreducible private states as follows (compare with [24], where approximate strictly reducible private states were defined):

Definition 10. *The private state $\gamma_{d,d'}$ is called ϵ -approximate irreducible state if it satisfies $\|\gamma_{d,d'} - \tilde{\gamma}_{d,d'}\|_1 \leq \epsilon$ for some irreducible private state $\tilde{\gamma}_{d,d'}$.*

A natural property that we would expect from the approximate irreducible private states is that they have the distillable key close to $\log d$. We prove a weaker condition, namely only for states that approximate those irreducible private states which are from the set $\mathcal{R}_{ir,M}$ with M being asymptotically continuous and bound on the distillable key. The bound then applies for E_r, E_r^∞, I_{sq} as they are all asymptotically continuous, and upper bound K_D . To be precise, in what follows by asymptotic continuity of M we mean the fact that for any two states satisfying $\|\rho - \rho'\| = \epsilon \leq 1$ there is:

$$|M(\rho) - M(\rho')| \leq O(\epsilon \log d + h(\epsilon)) \quad (68)$$

where h is the binary Shannon entropy, and the constant in $O(\cdot)$ notation is independent of the dimension d .

Observation 3. *For an ϵ -approximate irreducible private state γ_d with $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$ there is:*

$$K_D(\gamma_d) \geq \log d - 6\epsilon \log d - 4\eta(\epsilon), \quad (69)$$

where $\eta(x) = -x \log x$. If it also satisfies $\|\gamma_d - \tilde{\gamma}\|_1 \leq \epsilon$ such that $\tilde{\gamma} \in \mathcal{R}_{ir,M}$ where M is asymptotically continuous and $M \geq K_D$, then there is:

$$K_D(\gamma_d) \leq \log d + O(\epsilon \log d + h(\epsilon)). \quad (70)$$

In particular it is true for $M \in \{E_r, E_r^\infty, I_{sq}\}$.

Proof. For the first part of theorem we base on results of section V. Namely, from the proof of Theorem 5 it follows that

$$K_D(\gamma_d) \geq C_{DW}((\text{Tr}_{A'B'}(U^\dagger \rho U))_{ccq}) \quad (71)$$

where U is the unitary which defines γ_d . Now if $\|\rho - \gamma\| = \epsilon' \leq \epsilon$ by asymptotic continuity of C_{DW} obtained in inequalities (55-57), there is

$$C_{DW}((\text{Tr}_{A'B'}(U^\dagger \rho U))_{ccq}) \geq \log d - 6\epsilon' \log d - 4\eta(\epsilon'), \quad (72)$$

which for $\epsilon' \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$ implies the same inequality for ϵ due to monotonicity of the function η on interval $[0, 1]$ This proves the first part of thesis of this theorem. For the second part, by the assumption there exists an irreducible private state $\tilde{\gamma}$ close by ϵ in the trace norm to γ_d which has the property that $M(\gamma_d) = \log d$. We use the asymptotic continuity of M to obtain that $|M(\gamma_d) - M(\tilde{\gamma})| \leq O(\epsilon \log d + h(\epsilon))$. Hence $K_D(\gamma_d) \leq M(\gamma_d) \leq \log d + O(\epsilon \log d + h(\epsilon))$. $\square$

Let us note here, that if we are not interested in optimal constants in the formulation of the asymptotic continuity, then the above observation can be stated in much compressed way. Namely that for $\|\rho - \gamma_d\| \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$ there is:

$$|K_D(\rho) - \log d| \leq O(\epsilon \log d + h(\epsilon)), \quad (73)$$

if only $\gamma_d \in \mathcal{R}_{ir,M}$ with $M \geq K_D$ and M asymptotic continuous.

It is now tempting to ask whether the state is the ϵ -approximate irreducible private state γ_d if and only if $K_D \approx \log d$ (we have proven the "only if part" for some of them above). We leave this problem open, and will call the private states for which $|K_D(\gamma) - \log d| \leq \epsilon$ ϵ -almost irreducible private states. We give now an example of such a state constructed in [19], from which we quote next two paragraphs:

To begin with, we consider a family of states on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^2 \otimes (\mathcal{C}^{\tilde{d}^k} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{\tilde{d}^k})^{\otimes m}$ given in [5]:

$$\hat{\rho}_{p,\tilde{d},k,m} = \frac{1}{N_m} \begin{bmatrix} [p(\frac{\tau_1+\tau_2}{2})]^{\otimes m} & 0 & 0 & [p(\frac{\tau_1-\tau_2}{2})]^{\otimes m} \\ 0 & [(\frac{1}{2}-p)\tau_2]^{\otimes m} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & [(\frac{1}{2}-p)\tau_2]^{\otimes m} & 0 \\ [p(\frac{\tau_1-\tau_2}{2})]^{\otimes m} & 0 & 0 & [p(\frac{\tau_1+\tau_2}{2})]^{\otimes m} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (74)$$

where $N_m = 2(p^m) + 2(\frac{1}{2}-p)^m$, $\tau_1 = (\frac{\rho_a+\rho_s}{2})^{\otimes k}$ and $\tau_2 = (\rho_s)^{\otimes k}$, while ρ_s and ρ_a are the $\tilde{d}$ -dimensional symmetric and antisymmetric Werner state, respectively.

The state $\hat{\rho}_{p,\tilde{d},k,m}$ is PPT iff $p \leq \frac{1}{3}$ and $\frac{1-p}{p} \geq (\frac{\tilde{d}}{d-1})^k$ [5]. We satisfy this condition by setting $p = \frac{1}{3}$, $\tilde{d} = m^2$ and $k = m$, as then $(\frac{\tilde{d}}{d-1})^k < 2$ for $m \geq 2$. Then we define

$$\rho_m := \hat{\rho}_{1/3,m^2,m,m}, \quad (75)$$

with $m \geq 2$.

Now in the proof of Corollary 23 of [19] it is shown (together with construction), that there exists γ such that $\|\rho_m - \gamma\|_1 \leq f(\epsilon)$, where $f(\epsilon) = 2\sqrt{4\sqrt{2}\epsilon + \eta(2\sqrt{2}\epsilon)} + 2\sqrt{2}\epsilon$ where $\epsilon = \frac{2}{3} \left(1 - (1 - \frac{1}{2^m})^m \times \frac{1}{1+\frac{1}{2^m}}\right)$.

We will argue now that this γ is the $O(\exp(-m))$ -almost irreducible private state. For the upper bound on $K_D(\gamma)$ we note that by Lemma 24 of [19] there is $K_D(\gamma) \leq E_f(\gamma) \leq 1 + O(\exp(-m))$, where E_f is the entanglement of formation measure. On the other hand the state is private, hence $K_D(\gamma) \geq 1$ by the definition.

VII. DISCUSSION

We have considered distillation of the key from private states with non-trivial shield part. We have provided the first protocol, which distills the key not only from the key part of the private state but also exploits the shield of it. The protocol is rather intuitive: in the first step we decouple the key part and the shield by "sorting" the states on the shield conditionally on the value of the key on key part. In second we distill key from the states on shield, and to the total output state of the original key part and resulting state we apply the Devetak-Winter protocol. It is plausible, that the protocol is optimal, however we have proven only a better bound on it which reads:

$$\log d + E_r^\infty(\sigma_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}). \quad (76)$$

It would be interesting to answer this question. We also leave as open problem the question if our protocol has rate close to (2), when run on an approximate irreducible private state. At first it seems possible, as C_{DW} is asymptotically continuous, yet our protocol uses as subprotocol an optimal one for distillation of state $\sigma_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}$,

which need not yield optimal value on a close by state to the latter.

Presented protocol allowed us to characterize the irreducible private states - those for which distillable key equals log of dimension of the key part. These states in matrix form have key-undistillable states on diagonal. Formally, for a private is irreducible if and only if

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{ij} |ii\rangle\langle jj| \otimes U_i \sigma U_j^\dagger \quad (77)$$

with $K_D(U_i \sigma U_i^\dagger) = 0$, that is, its conditional states are key-undistillable. In turn the private states with $2 \otimes 2$ dimensional key part and shield are *only* strictly irreducible. To further characterize them, we observe, that the latter form strictly larger set than the set based on *absolutely separable states* as proposed in [23].

A major problem left over, which stays behind our considerations is whether there exist entangled key-undistillable states. We show, that if they do not exist, then the class of irreducible private states collapses to the class of strictly irreducible ones, having $K_D = E_r$. If not, then we may have other subsets, with $K_D = M$ where M is some entanglement measure which is an upper bound on K_D , like E_r^∞ and I_{sq} . We show that these sets have nice property of being closed under tensor product.

Finally, we show how our result may lead to the generalization of one of the results of [24]. It is shown there that the key repeater rate R of any strictly irreducible states γ (in two copies) $R(\gamma \otimes \gamma)$ is upper bounded by the distillable entanglement $E_D(\gamma \otimes \gamma)$. To generalize this result to *all* irreducible private states, one needs only that (i) the key-attacked state of the private state is key-undistillable, which we prove for all irreducible private states and (ii) that key-undistillable states are far from private states in trace norm distance:

$$\inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{Z}} \|\rho - \gamma_d\|_1 \geq 1 - \frac{1}{d} \quad (78)$$

as it is true for separable states [23], which are known to be key-undistillable [44]. We provide the first lower bound on this distance, yet quite small, achieving asymptotically the value $\frac{1}{6}$. It would be interesting to prove a better bound, possibly matching the one for separable states, which is as above. It may however be possible that (78) does not hold, yet the bound on key-repeaters of [24] is true, as key-undistillable states may be lead via any repeater protocol to a separable state on Alice's and

Bob's lab. Answering this question would show that irreducible private states are useless for transferring key for long distances unless they have high distillable entanglement.

Acknowledgements

KH thanks Matthias Christandl and Roberto Ferrara for discussions and Mark Wilde for usefull comments.

Authors acknowledge grant Sonata Bis 5 (grant number: 2015/18/E/ST2/00327) from the National Science Center. KH and PĆ acknowledge also the EU grant ERC AdG QOLAPS. AR acknowledges also grant No. 2014/14/M/ST2/00818 from the National Science Center. MS also thanks the Seventh framework programme EU grant RAQUEL No 323970 for the support.

Appendix A: Classical distillable key

Let us recall here the definition of the distillable classical key, which we adapt from [7].

Definition 11. *The classical distillable key for any given state $\rho_{ABE} \in B(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C)$ is defined as the rate at which private states can be distilled under bipartite LOPC operations (local operations and public communication - the difference between the standard local operations and classical communication (LOCC) and LOPC lies in the fact that in the latter we need to remember that any classical message announced by the involved parties may be registered by Eve) $\Lambda'_{A:BE}$ [7]:*

$$C_D(\rho_{AB}) \equiv \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\Lambda'_{A:BE}} \left\{ K : \left\| \Lambda'(\rho^{\otimes n}) - (\rho)_{ccq}^{nK} \right\|_1 \leq \epsilon \right\}, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $\|\cdot\|_1$ denotes the trace norm.

The above definition works for any input tripartite state ρ_{ABE} . However in the case where the total state is pure, we observe that the latter is determined by the state $\rho_{AB} = \text{Tr}_E \rho_{ABE}$ up to unitary transformations on Eve's side. Since from the very definition C_D does not change under such transformations, the latter freedom is not an issue, so that we can say the state ρ_{AB} completely determines the total state. Thus we get definition of distillable classical secure key from *bipartite* state ρ_{AB}

Definition 12. *For given bipartite state ρ_{AB} the distillable classical secure key is given by*

$$C_D(\rho_{AB}) \equiv C_D(\psi_{ABE}) \quad (\text{A2})$$

where ψ_{ABE} is the purification of ρ_{AB} .

Appendix B: Proof of Theorem 1

We are going to prove here the main theorem of the manuscript, namely that we have a protocol that can distill key not only from the key part but also from the shield of a private state in case where $\sigma_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}$ is distillable.

Let us recall that it key rate is given the following thorem:

Theorem 1. *For a private state γ_d , there is*

$$K_D(\gamma) \geq \log d + \frac{1}{d} K_D(\sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}). \quad (\text{B1})$$

Recall that the input to the protocol $P(m, k)$ is $\gamma_d^{\otimes(mk)}$, where γ is a private state with $d \otimes d$ dimensional key part. The private state γ_d has also finite dimensional shield, which without loss of generality we may assume to be of dimension $d' \otimes d'$. Parameters m and k will be chosen later. We first recall the protocol:

1. For each of k blocks of m states Alice and Bob repeat items 2-6 as follows:
2. Alice and Bob measure their subsystems of the key part A and B .

3. If number $t_s(m)$ of any symbol $s \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ in the key $|i_0\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |i_m\rangle$ with $i_j \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ is below the threshold $\delta(m)$, i.e. $|\frac{m}{d} - t_s(m)| > \delta(m)$, they trace out the original state, produce the error state $|e\rangle_{AA'} \otimes |e\rangle_{BB'}$. They then proceed with step 2 on the next block if such is left, or go directly to step 7 otherwise. If however $|\frac{m}{d} - t_s(m)| \leq \delta(m)$ for all s , they proceed with the steps 4 – 6 of the protocol.
4. Alice and Bob perform each control-permutation operation: depending on the value of the key $|i_0\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |i_m\rangle$ with $i_j \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ they permute states on the systems $A'B'$ from its original form $\sigma_{i_0} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{i_m}$ to $\sigma_0^{\otimes t_0(m)} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}^{\otimes t_{d-1}(m)}$.
5. If necessary Alice and Bob trace out some of the states $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_d$ leaving only $t_{\min}(m) = \lceil \frac{m}{d} - \delta(m) \rceil$ of copies of the state $\sigma \equiv \sigma_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}$.
6. As a subprotocol, Alice and Bob perform on systems $A'B'$ any optimal key distillation protocol of the state σ , acting on $(\sigma_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{d-1})^{\otimes t_{\min}(m)}$, with output close in the trace norm to the state $\gamma_{A'B'A''B''}$. The state on systems AB from the item 3 and state on systems $A'B'A''B''$ form one of the k input states for the final step 7 of the protocol.
7. On k output states of the k repetitions of items 2-6 (or items 2 – 3 if unsuccessful in item 3 respectively) Alice and Bob perform the Devetak-Winter protocol [30].

As it was argued in the main text, in what follows, we can w.l.g. assume $K_D(\sigma_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}) > 0$, as otherwise the bound from theorem is trivially satisfied without need for the above protocol.

We will now examine how the output state of the protocol looks like. Let us fix some $\delta'(m) > 0$. As we already noticed, we start from a pbit $\gamma_{ABA'B'E}^{\otimes m}$. In what follows we will write $|\psi\rangle$ instead of $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ for ease of notation. After projection on the key part and control-sorting of the key part and shield, the state is:

$$\sum_{t \in G} \frac{|Q_t|}{d^m} \left[\sum_{i \in Q_t} \frac{1}{|Q_t|} |ii_{AB}\rangle \langle ii_{AB}| \right] \otimes |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes t_0(m)} \otimes \dots \otimes |\psi_{d-1}\rangle^{\otimes t_{d-1}(m)} + p_B |e\rangle_{AA'} \otimes |e\rangle_{BB'} \otimes |e\rangle_E. \quad (\text{B2})$$

Here $|\psi_0\rangle$ is purification of $\sigma_0 = U_0 \sigma_{A'B'} U_0^\dagger$, and similar for $|\psi_k\rangle$ for $k \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$. The multi-index $i = (i_1, \dots, i_m)$, where $i_j \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$, the set G is the set of types satisfying $|t_s - \frac{1}{d}| \leq \delta(m)$ for all $s \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$, and the set of all strings i of the type t is denoted as Q_t . To simplify the notation, we will write Eq. (B2) as

$$\sum_{t \in G} p(t) \rho_t \otimes |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes t_0(m)} \otimes \dots \otimes |\psi_{d-1}\rangle^{\otimes t_{d-1}(m)} + p_B |e\rangle_{AA'} \otimes |e\rangle_{BB'} \otimes |e\rangle_E, \quad (\text{B3})$$

where $p(t) = \frac{|Q_t|}{d^m}$ and $\rho_t = \sum_{i \in Q_t} \frac{1}{|Q_t|} |ii_{AB}\rangle \langle ii_{AB}|$. Moreover we have

$$p_B = 1 - \sum_{t \in G} p(t). \quad (\text{B4})$$

The state $|e\rangle_{AA'} \otimes |e\rangle_{BB'} \otimes |e\rangle_E$ is an error state produced when there are too little of $\sigma_0 \dots \sigma_{d-1}$. From properties of types, there is $p_B \leq p(m)$ [31] with

$$p(m) = 2^{-m \left(\frac{\delta(m)^2}{2 \ln 2} - d \frac{\log(m+1)}{m} \right)}, \quad (\text{B5})$$

i.e. decays exponentially fast with m . Moreover the cardinality of the set $\mathcal{T}$ of all types reads the following value and a bound:

$$|\mathcal{T}| = \binom{m+d-1}{m} \leq 2^{mh \left(\frac{m}{m+d-1} \right)}, \quad (\text{B6})$$

where h is the Shannon binary entropy.

According to item 5 of the protocol Alice and Bob trace (if needed) some of states σ_i , leaving $t_{\min}(m) = \lceil \frac{m}{d} - \delta(m) \rceil$ of states $\sigma_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{d-1} \equiv \sigma$. For simplicity we will denote $t_{\min}(m)$ as $t(m)$. Without loss of generality we may assume that Eve knows the very type of string i of system AB which we denote as $|t\rangle\langle t|_{\bar{E}}$. Indeed, she may actually conclude t from the kind and number of states traced out in item 5. Altogether the input state in item 6 of the protocol is of the form :

$$\rho_{in} = \sum_{t \in G} p(t) \rho_t \otimes (|\psi_0\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\psi_{d-1}\rangle)^{\otimes t(m)}_{A'B'E} \otimes |t\rangle\langle t|_{\bar{E}} + p_B |e\rangle\langle e|_{AA'} \otimes |e\rangle\langle e|_{BB'} \otimes |e\rangle\langle e|_{E\bar{E}}, \quad (\text{B7})$$

where $|\psi_k\rangle \equiv |\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|$.

On the system $A'B'$ Alice and Bob have then $A'B'$ subsystem of the state $(|\psi_0\rangle \otimes |\psi_1\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |\psi_{d-1}\rangle)^{\otimes t(m)}$. Now from the very definition of distillable key, for any good t (that is $t \in G$), from this they distill by some operation $\Lambda_{t(m)}$ a state

$$\|\hat{\gamma}_{d_{t(m)}} - \gamma_{d_{t(m)}}\|_1 \leq \epsilon'_{t(m)} \quad (\text{B8})$$

on systems $A'B'A''B'$ such that

$$\frac{\log d_{t(m)}}{t(m)} \geq K_D(\sigma_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}) - \delta'(m) \quad (\text{B9})$$

$\gamma_{A'B'A''B'}$ is a private state. For bad t (that is $t \notin G$), $\Lambda_{t(m)}$ creates additional flags $|e\rangle_{A''} \otimes |e\rangle_{B''}$. Without loss of generality we may assume that it is accompanied by creation of state $|e_{E''}\rangle$. To analyze the key rate of the considered protocol it will be convenient to use the notion of classical distillable key [30] C_D (for the definition, see Appendix). It is shown that if there exists protocol which distills from ρ a state close to private state by ϵ via LOCC operation, then there also exists a protocol with *local operations and public communication*, which works on purification of the input state ρ and distills state that is close to an *ideal ccq state* by $2\sqrt{\epsilon}$ (see theorem 4.11 of [23]), with the same rate of key ($K_D(\rho) = C_D(\psi_\rho)$). In our case $K_D((\sigma_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{d-1})^{\otimes t(m)}) = C_D((|\psi_0\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |\psi_{d-1}\rangle)^{\otimes t(m)})$. Hence, there exists LOPC operation $\tilde{\Lambda}_{t(m)}$ which distills state $\hat{\alpha}_{A'B'E'}(d_{t(m)})$ of the ccq form $\sum_{i,j=0}^{d_{t(m)}} |ij\rangle\langle ij|_{A'B'} \otimes \rho_{E'}^{(ij)}$, such that:

$$\|\hat{\alpha}_{A'B'E'}(d_{t(m)}) - \alpha_{ideal}(d_{t(m)})\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{\epsilon'_{t(m)}}, \quad (\text{B10})$$

where

$$\alpha_{ideal}(d_{t(m)}) = \frac{1}{d_{t(m)}} \sum_{k=0}^{d_{t(m)}-1} |kk\rangle\langle kk|_{A'B'} \otimes \rho_{E'}. \quad (\text{B11})$$

As we will see, to lower bound the key rate of the considered protocol, it is enough to analyze the state which would be the output of $\tilde{\Lambda}_{t(m)}$:

$$\rho_m = \sum_{t \in G} p(t) \rho_t \otimes \hat{\alpha}_{A'B'E'}(d, t(m)) \otimes |t\rangle\langle t|_{\tilde{E}} + p_B |e\rangle\langle e|_{AA'} \otimes |e\rangle\langle e|_{BB'} \otimes |e\rangle\langle e|_{E''}, \quad (\text{B12})$$

where $|t\rangle\langle t|$ is the state which describes Eve's knowledge about type t of her total state on $E'' = E' \tilde{E}$. Our figure of merit will be state which is close by in the trace norm distance, and simpler to analyze. This is the above state with α_{ideal} in place of $\hat{\alpha}(d_{t(m)})$:

$$\rho'_m = \sum_{t \in G} p(t) \rho_t \otimes (\alpha_{ideal})_{A'B'E'} \otimes |t\rangle\langle t|_{\tilde{E}} + p_B |e\rangle\langle e|_{AA'} \otimes |e\rangle\langle e|_{BB'} \otimes |e\rangle\langle e|_{E''}. \quad (\text{B13})$$

To see that the above state is close to ρ_m observe that for all $t, t' \in G$ such that $t' \neq t$ there is $\rho_t \otimes |t\rangle\langle t| \perp \rho_{t'} \otimes |t'\rangle\langle t'|$. We can also assume w.l.g. that symbol e of the error states $|e\rangle_{AA'} \otimes |e\rangle_{BB'} \otimes |e\rangle_{E''}$ does not belong to the set $\Sigma = \{0, \dots, d-1\}^{\times m}$. Thanks to these two facts, via properties of the trace norm and Eq. (B10) we obtain:

$$\|\rho_m - \rho'_m\|_1 < \epsilon_{t(m)}, \quad (\text{B14})$$

where $\epsilon_{t(m)} \equiv 2\sqrt{\epsilon'_{t(m)}}$.

We will now reduce the problem of calculating the rate of the considered protocol to study of the Devetak-Winter formula of certain state as follows, which shows that it is enough to analyze the state (B12)

$$\forall_{m,k} \quad mk K_D(\gamma_d) \geq K_D(\gamma_d^{\otimes mk}) = C_D(\psi_{\gamma_d}^{\otimes mk}) \geq C_D(\rho_{in}^{\otimes k}) \geq C_D(\rho_m^{\otimes k}) \geq \mathcal{R}_{DW}(\rho_m^{\otimes k}), \quad (\text{B15})$$

In first inequality we use definition of K_D which, as operational entanglement measure is regularized by definition. We then use the aforementioned equivalence between C_D and K_D where C_D is calculated on the purification of input state $|\psi_{\gamma_d}\rangle$ to system of Eve. We then use the fact that C_D is non-increasing under operations of Alice and Bob. By

$\mathcal{R}_{DW}$ we denote the rate of the (one-way) Devetak-Winter protocol run for k copies of the state. In the last step we follow [9], observing that it need not be optimal, yet is good enough for our purpose, hence the last inequality follows. From [30] we have that:

$$\mathcal{R}_{DW}(\rho_m^{\otimes k}) = k(I(AA' : BB')_{\rho_m} - I(AA' : E'')_{\rho_m}) - o(k) \equiv kC_{DW}(\rho_m) - o(k), \quad (\text{B16})$$

hence, in the limit of large k there is:

$$K_D(\gamma_d) \geq \frac{1}{m}(I(AA' : BB')_{\rho_m} - I(AA' : E'')_{\rho_m}) \equiv \frac{1}{m}C_{DW}(\rho_m), \quad (\text{B17})$$

for all m . It is then enough to find lower bound on the RHS of the above inequality. We will find it using asymptotic continuity of entropy (and conditional entropy), based on the fact that ρ_m is close to ρ'_m for which it is rather easy to calculate the entropies. Lemma 1 states that

$$C_{DW}(\rho_m) \geq m \log d + (1 - p_B)t(m)(K_D(\sigma) - \delta(m)) - mh \left(\frac{m}{m + d - 1} \right) - f(\epsilon_{t(m)}, d, d_{t(m)}, m) \quad (\text{B18})$$

with $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty, \epsilon_n \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{m}f(\epsilon_{t(m)}, d, d_{t(m)}, m) = 0$. Thus in limit of large $m = sd$ ($s \rightarrow \infty$) we obtain the desired lower bound. To see this observe that we can set $\delta(m) = \frac{2 \log m \sqrt{d}}{\sqrt{m}}$ which assures $p_B \rightarrow 0$. Further, $\frac{t(m)}{m} \geq \frac{1}{d} - \delta(m)$, thus we have:

$$t(m)(K_D(\sigma) - \delta'(m)) \geq \frac{1}{d}K_D(\sigma) - \delta(m)K_D(\sigma) - \delta'(m). \quad (\text{B19})$$

Finally $K_D(\sigma) \leq d \log d'$ where d' is the dimension of the shield part of γ_d , hence the pre-last term in the above tends to 0 with m for our choice of $\delta(m)$. Now, since $h(1) = 0$, the term $h(\frac{m}{m+d-1})$ vanishes asymptotically as well. Finally $\delta'(m)$ was arbitrarily small, hence the thesis. $\square$

Lemma 1. *For the state ρ_m from Eq. (B12), there is:*

$$\begin{aligned} C_{DW}(\rho_m) &\geq m \log d + (1 - p_B)t(m)(K_D(\sigma_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{d-1}) - \delta(m)) \\ &\quad - mh \left(\frac{m}{m + d - 1} \right) - f(\epsilon_{t(m)}, d, d_{t(m)}, m) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B20})$$

with $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty, \epsilon_n \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{m}f(\epsilon_{t(m)}, d, d_{t(m)}, m) = 0$.

Inserting the state ρ_m into Eq. (B16) gives

$$C_{DW}(\rho_m) = I(AA' : BB')_{\rho_m} - I(AA' : E'')_{\rho_m}. \quad (\text{B21})$$

However, we will compute the above quantity for ρ'_m and will use the asymptotic continuity of C_{DW} .

We will first lower bound $I(AA' : BB')$. From the definition of quantum mutual entropy, it is equal to

$$I(AA' : BB') = S(AA') - S(AA'|BB'), \quad (\text{B22})$$

where $S(AA'|BB')$ is the quantum conditional entropy. We will also use the Fannes inequality for the asymptotic continuity of the von Neumann entropy [45], i.e. for $\|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1 \leq \epsilon$ we have

$$|S(\rho_1) - S(\rho_2)| \leq \|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1 \log d + \eta(\|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1), \quad (\text{B23})$$

where $\eta(x) = -x \log x$, and the Alicki-Fannes inequality for continuity of the conditional entropy [46]:

$$|S_{X|Y}(\rho_1) - S_{X|Y}(\rho_2)| \leq 4\|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1 \log d_X + h(\|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1), \quad (\text{B24})$$

where here X, Y denotes two subsystems of ρ_1 and ρ_2 .

Direct calculations of entropies for the state ρ'_m give for each part

$$S(AA') = (1 - p_B) \log d_{t(m)} + S \left(\sum_T p(T) \tilde{\rho}_T \right), \quad (\text{B25})$$

where for $T = \{t : t \in G \vee t = t_B\}$, $p(T) = p(t)$ for $t \in G$ and $p(T = t_B) = p_B$. Then, for $T \in G$, $\rho_T = \rho_t = \text{Tr}_B \sum_{i \in Q_t} \frac{1}{|Q_t|} |ii\rangle\langle ii|_{AB}$ and for $T = t_B$, $\tilde{\rho}_T = |e\rangle\langle e|_A$.

We know that

$$\log d_{t(m)} \geq t(m) (K_D(\sigma) - \delta(m)). \quad (\text{B26})$$

The entropy of BB' is the same as $S(AA')$. It remains to calculate the joint entropy $S(AA'BB')$, which is equal to $S(AA')$, since the systems AA' and BB' are maximally correlated. We are going to lower bound $I(AA' : BB')_{\rho_m}$ as follows:

$$|I(AA' : BB')_{\rho_m} - I(AA' : BB')_{\rho'_m}| \leq |S(AA')_{\rho_m} - S(AA')_{\rho'_m}| + |S(AA'|BB')_{\rho_m} - S(AA'|BB')_{\rho'_m}|. \quad (\text{B27})$$

Now in the RHS we apply the asymptotic continuity of the entropies obtaining :

$$|I(AA' : BB')_{\rho_m} - I(AA' : BB')_{\rho'_m}| \leq 5\epsilon_{t(m)} \log(d d_{t(m)}) + 3h(\epsilon_{t(m)}). \quad (\text{B28})$$

hence for $g'_1(\epsilon_{t(m)}, d, d_{t(m)}, m) = 5\epsilon_{t(m)} \log(d d_{t(m)}) + 3h(\epsilon_{t(m)})$ we have:

$$I(AA' : BB')_{\rho_m} \geq (1 - p_B) \log d_{t(m)} + S\left(\sum_T p(T) \tilde{\rho}_T\right) - g'_1(\epsilon_{t(m)}, d, d', m). \quad (\text{B29})$$

Finally we observe that

$$\left\| \sum_T p(T) \tilde{\rho}_T - \frac{\mathbf{1}}{d^m} \right\|_1 \leq 2p_B. \quad (\text{B30})$$

thus, again via the Fannes inequality:

$$I(AA' : BB')_{\rho_m} \geq (1 - p_B) \log d_{t(m)} + m \log d - 2p_B m \log d - h(2p_B) - g'_1(\epsilon_{t(m)}, d, d_{t(m)}, m) \quad (\text{B31})$$

denote

$$g_1(\epsilon_{t(m)}, d, d_{t(m)}, m) \equiv 2p_B m \log d + h(2p_B) + g'_1(\epsilon_{t(m)}, d, d_{t(m)}, m). \quad (\text{B32})$$

We are left with calculating $I(AA' : E'')$. It is equal to $I(AA' : E'') = S(AA') - S(AA'|E'')$, where $S(AA'|E'') = S(AA'E'') - S(E'')$ is the conditional entropy. The entropy $S(AA')$ is already bounded in (B25). Next, we have

$$S(E'') = (1 - p_B) S(\rho_{E'}) + H(\{p(T)\}), \quad (\text{B33})$$

where $\rho_{E'} = \text{Tr}_{A'B'} \alpha_{ideal}$ and $H(\cdot)$ is the Shannon entropy. Finally,

$$S(AA'E'') = H(\{p(T)\}) + (1 - p_B) (\log d_{t(m)} + S(\rho_{E'})) + \sum_{t \in G} p(t) S(\rho_t). \quad (\text{B34})$$

Summing up, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I(AA' : E'')_{\rho'_m} &\leq -H(\{p(T)\}) + H(\{p(T)\}) + S\left(\sum_T p(T) \tilde{\rho}_T\right) - \sum_{t \in G} p(t) S(\rho_t) \\ &= S\left(\sum_T p(T) \tilde{\rho}_T\right) - \sum_T p(T) S(\tilde{\rho}_T) =: \chi, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B35})$$

By the asymptotic continuity of entropy and conditional entropy, we have:

$$|I(AA' : E'')_{\rho_m} - I(AA' : E')_{\rho'_m}| \leq \epsilon_{t(m)} \log d_{t(m)} + \eta(\epsilon_{t(m)}) + 4\epsilon_{t(m)} \log(d^m d_{t(m)}) + 2h(\epsilon_{t(m)}), \quad (\text{B36})$$

but, since $I(AA' : E')_{\rho'_m} \leq \chi$,

$$I(AA' : E'')_{\rho_m} \leq \chi + \epsilon_{t(m)} \log d_{t(m)} + \eta(\epsilon_{t(m)}) + 4\epsilon_{t(m)} \log(d^m d_{t(m)}) + 2h(\epsilon_{t(m)}). \quad (\text{B37})$$

Let us set

$$g_2(\epsilon_{t(m)}, d, d', m) \equiv \epsilon_{t(m)} \log d_{t(m)} + \eta(\epsilon_{t(m)}) + 4\epsilon_{t(m)} \log(d^m d_{t(m)}) + 2h(\epsilon_{t(m)}). \quad (\text{B38})$$

Knowing that the Holevo quantity is upper bounded by the entropy of the signal distribution we have [47]

$$\chi = S\left(\sum_T p(T) \tilde{\rho}_T\right) - \sum_T p(T) S(\tilde{\rho}_T) \leq H(\{p(T)\}) \leq H(\{p(t)\}). \quad (\text{B39})$$

Now entropy of the "distribution of types" is less than the log of the support of this distribution which is the number of types. Hence by (B6) we have:

$$S\left(\sum_T p(T) \tilde{\rho}_T\right) - \sum_T p(T) S(\tilde{\rho}_T) \leq mh \left(\frac{m}{m+d-1}\right). \quad (\text{B40})$$

and thus $I(AA' : E'') \leq mh \left(\frac{m}{m+d-1}\right) + g_2(\epsilon_{t(m)}, d, d_{t(m)}, m)$.

Summing up bounds (B31) and (B37) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} C_{DW}(\rho_m) &\geq (1 - p_B) \log d_{t(m)} + m \log d - g_1(\epsilon_{t(m)}, d, d_{t(m)}, m) \\ &\quad - mh \left(\frac{m}{m+d-1}\right) - g_2(\epsilon_{t(m)}, d, d_{t(m)}, m). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B41})$$

Due to (B26) there is:

$$\begin{aligned} C_{DW}(\rho_m) &\geq (1 - p_B)t(m) (K_D(\sigma) - \delta(m)) + m \log d - g_1(\epsilon_{t(m)}, d, d_{t(m)}, m) \\ &\quad - mh \left(\frac{m}{m+d-1}\right) - g_2(\epsilon_{t(m)}, d, d_{t(m)}, m). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B42})$$

Define now $f = g_1 + g_2$ and observe, that for $m = sd$ with $s \rightarrow \infty$ such defined $f(\epsilon_{t(m)}, d, d_{t(m)}, m)$ divided by m approaches 0 with $\epsilon_{t(m)}$ approaching 0. Indeed apart from bounded terms in f such as $h(\epsilon_{t(m)})$ which are clearly sublinear in m , we have terms $O(\epsilon_{t(m)} \log(d^m d_{t(m)}))$. Such term breaks into two $\epsilon_{t(m)} m \log d$ and $\epsilon_{t(m)} \log d_{t(m)}$. The first term is sublinear in m if only $\epsilon_{t(m)} \rightarrow 0$. This is assured by $m = sd$ so that $t(m) \approx \frac{m}{d} \rightarrow \infty$. The second term is equal to

$$\epsilon_{t(m)} \log((d')^d)^{t(m)} = \epsilon_{t(m)} t(m) d \log d' \leq \epsilon_{t(m)} \left(\frac{m}{d} + \delta(m)\right) d \log d' = \epsilon_{t(m)} m \log d' + \epsilon_{t(m)} \delta(m) d \log d'. \quad (\text{B43})$$

The first term of the RHS of last equality is sublinear in m as we argued above, while the second vanishes for our choice of $\delta(m) = \frac{2 \log m \sqrt{d}}{\sqrt{m}}$. Hence the assertion follows. $\square$

Appendix C: Definition of Key Swapping Rate

In this section, for the sake of completeness, we recall the definition of the *key swapping rate* introduced in [24] and used by us in Section IV.

Definition 13. For all bipartite states ρ and $\tilde{\rho}$, we define the quantum key swapping rate achieved with key swapping protocols as:

$$\hat{R}_D(\rho, \tilde{\rho}) \equiv \lim_{\substack{\delta \rightarrow 0 \\ \epsilon \rightarrow 0 \\ \tilde{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0}} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{\Lambda_{A:C:B} \\ \Gamma_{A:C} \\ \tilde{\Gamma}_{\tilde{C}:B}}} \left\{ R : \text{Tr}_C \Lambda \left(\gamma^{\langle nr \rangle} \otimes \gamma^{\langle n\tilde{r} \rangle} \right) \approx_\delta \gamma_{nR}, \Gamma(\rho^{\otimes n}) \approx_\epsilon \gamma^{\langle nr \rangle}, \tilde{\Gamma}(\tilde{\rho}^{\otimes n}) \approx_{\tilde{\epsilon}} \gamma^{\langle n\tilde{r} \rangle} \right\}, \quad (\text{C1})$$

where by $\gamma^{\langle n\tilde{r} \rangle}, \gamma^{\langle nr \rangle}$ we denote the strictly irreducible private state with dimension of the key part $\lceil n\tilde{r} \rceil$ and $\lceil nr \rceil$ respectively, by γ_{nR} the private state with dimension of the key part equal to $\lceil nR \rceil$. Moreover, by $\Lambda_{A:C:B}, \Gamma_{A:C}$ and $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\tilde{C}:B}$ we denote LOCC maps acting on respective subsystems.

In the above expression we use the notation $\rho \approx_\epsilon \sigma$ for $\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \epsilon$ to compress the definition.

Appendix D: Multipartite private states

Definition 14. (compare [6]) Let U_i be some unitary operations for every i and let $\varrho_{A'B'_1 \dots B'_l}$ be a density matrix acting on $\mathcal{H}'$. By the multipartite private state or multipartite pdit of $l+1$ subsystems we mean the following

$$\gamma_{AB_1 \dots B_l A' B'_1 \dots B'_l}^{(d)} = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i,j=0}^{d-1} |i^{(1)} \dots i^{(l)}\rangle \langle j^{(1)} \dots j^{(l)}| \otimes U_i \varrho_{A'B'_1 \dots B'_l} U_j^\dagger. \quad (D1)$$

Naturally, for $l = 1$ the above reproduces the bipartite private states. Moreover, in that case, the multipartite distillable key satisfies [6]

$$C_D(\varrho_{AB_1 \dots B_l E}) \geq \min_{j \in \{1, \dots, l\}} I(A : B_j)(\varrho_{AB_j E}^{(\text{cqq})}) - I(A : E)(\varrho_{AB_j E}^{(\text{cqq})}). \quad (D2)$$

Here, $\varrho_{AB_j E}^{(\text{cqq})}$ denotes the cqq state, which arises from the general one by tracing out all the parties but the first and j th one and Eve.

1. Proof of Theorem 1 for multipartite private states

In this section we will argue, that the same lower bound as given in Theorem 1 holds in the case of multipartite private states.

We show this by studying the rate of the analogous protocol as described in Section II, with $B \rightarrow B_1, \dots, B_l$ for some finite number l of the parties, so that the total private state has $l+1$ subsystems (l th+1 denoted as A for the Alices' subsystem). We note that the protocol is realizable, since multipartite private state has maximally correlated subsystems in secure basis, so that each of the parties can perform control-sorting of the conditional states σ_i which is the main step of the protocol.

We will show now the cases when the proof for bipartite case needs to be modified. The state in (B2) is the same with the only change that

1. $\rho_t = \sum_i \frac{1}{|Q_i|} |i\mathbf{i}\rangle \langle i\mathbf{i}|_{AB_1 \dots B_l}$, where $\mathbf{i}$ is the multiindex with l values i each for one of several Bob's system
2. the error state has more error flags: $|e\rangle_A \otimes |e\rangle_{B_1} \otimes \dots \otimes |e\rangle_{B_l} \otimes |e\rangle_E$.

These two changes are the only modifications of the state ρ_{in} of Eq. (B7) to the multipartite case. Further, although the state E' is different than in bipartite case, due to larger number of communication, we never used actual form of its state, hence it is still denoted as $\rho_{E'}$. In particular in Eq. (B10) the only difference is that the state α_{ideal} is of the form:

$$\alpha_{ideal} = \frac{1}{d_{t(m)}} \sum_{k=0}^{d_{t(m)}-1} |k\mathbf{k}\rangle \langle k\mathbf{k}|_{AB_1 \dots B_l} \otimes \rho_{E'} \quad (D3)$$

with $\mathbf{k} = k \dots k$ for l systems. In this step we have used analogous fact to $K_D = C_D$ in multipartite case give in [6]. Now the analogues of states ρ_m and ρ'_m (denote them $\rho_m(l)$ and $\rho_m(l)'$), differ from ρ_m and ρ'_m respectively only by the two aforementioned changes 1 and 2 as well as difference in definition of α_{ideal} and $\hat{\alpha}_{ideal}$. It is then clear that

$$\|\rho_m(l) - \rho_m(l)'\|_1 \leq \epsilon_{t(m)}. \quad (D4)$$

Further we have by analogous considerations and the inequality D2 the lower bound:

$$K_D(\gamma_d) \geq \frac{1}{m} \left(\min_{i \in \{1, \dots, l\}} I(AA' : B_i B'_i)_{\rho_m(l)} - I(AA' : E'')_{\rho_m(l)} \right) \equiv \frac{1}{m} \tilde{R}_{DW}(\rho_m(l)). \quad (D5)$$

Without loss of generality we may assume that the above minimization is realized for $i = 1$. It is now crucial to observe, that

$$\forall_{i \in \{1, \dots, l\}} \rho_{m|AA'B_i B'_i E''}(l)' = \rho_{m|AA'B_1 B'_1 E''}(l)' \quad (D6)$$

where $\rho_{m|AA'B_i B'_i E''}(l)'$ is the state $\rho_m(l)'$ after tracing out all systems $B_j \neq B_i$. We then use the fact that due to (D4), the state $\rho_{m|AA'B_1 B'_1 E''}(l)$ is close in trace norm to $\rho_{m|AA'B_1 B'_1 E''}(l)'$, so that we can compute $\tilde{R}_{DW}(\rho_m(l)')$

and use asymptotic continuity of the mutual information to conclude about $\tilde{R}_{DW}(\rho_m(l))$. It is then crucial to observe that $\rho_{m|AA'B_1B'_1E''}(l)'$ has the same form as ρ'_m . Thus we conclude that the main claim of the Lemma 1 stays the same in multipartite case. What changes is the function $f(\epsilon_m, d_{t(m)}, d, m)$, with a substitution $d' \rightarrow d^l$, as there are l parties. However we still have $\frac{1}{m}f(\epsilon_m, d_{t(m)}, d, m) \rightarrow 0$ for the same $\delta(m)$ as in the bipartite case. It is just more demanding for ϵ_m and $\delta(m)$ to make $l \log d'$ zero, which is yet possible as long as l is constant. We have then proved, that the proof for the multipartite case is *mutatis mutandis* equivalent to the bipartite one.

-
- [1] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard, in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems and Signal Processing* (IEEE Computer Society Press, New York, Bangalore, India, December 1984, 1984), pp. 175–179.
 - [2] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, *Phys. Rev.* **47**, 777 (1935).
 - [3] A. K. Ekert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 661 (1991).
 - [4] P. W. Shor and J. Preskill, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 441 (2000), quant-ph/0003004.
 - [5] K. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and J. Oppenheim, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 160502 (2005), quant-ph/0309110.
 - [6] R. Augusiak and P. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 042307 (2009).
 - [7] K. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and J. Oppenheim, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **55**, 1898 (2009), quant-ph/0506189.
 - [8] M. Christandl, Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge (2006).
 - [9] M. Christandl, A. Ekert, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, and R. Renner, eprint arXiv:quant-ph/0608199 (2006), quant-ph/0608199.
 - [10] D. Yang, K. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, and W. Song, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* p. 3375 (2009).
 - [11] M. M. Wilde, *Quantum Information Processing* **15**, 4563 (2016), 1606.08028.
 - [12] M. Takeoka, S. Guha, and M. M. Wilde, *ArXiv e-prints* (2013), 1310.0129.
 - [13] M. Takeoka, S. Guha, and M. M. Wilde, *Nature Communications* **5**, 5235 (2014), 1504.06390.
 - [14] S. Pirandola, R. Laurenza, C. Ottaviani, and L. Banchi, *ArXiv e-prints* (2015), 1510.08863.
 - [15] S. Pirandola, *ArXiv e-prints* (2016), 1601.00966.
 - [16] M. Takeoka, K. P. Seshadreesan, and M. M. Wilde, *ArXiv e-prints* (2016), 1601.05563.
 - [17] M. M. Wilde, M. Tomamichel, and M. Berta, *ArXiv e-prints* (2016), 1602.08898.
 - [18] R. Laurenza and S. Pirandola, *ArXiv e-prints* (2016), 1603.07262.
 - [19] S. Bäuml, M. Christandl, K. Horodecki, and A. Winter, *Nature Communications* **6**, 6908 (2015), 1402.5927.
 - [20] H.-J. Briegel, W. Dür, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 5932 (1998).
 - [21] J. Barrett, L. Hardy, and A. Kent, *Physical Review Letters* **95**, 010503 (2005), quant-ph/0405101.
 - [22] J. Barrett, R. Colbeck, and A. Kent, *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 062326 (2012), 1209.0435.
 - [23] K. Horodecki, Ph.D. thesis, University of Warsaw, Faculty of Mathematics, Informatics and Mechanics (2008).
 - [24] M. Christandl and R. Ferrara, *ArXiv e-prints* (2016), 1609.04696.
 - [25] V. Vedral, M. B. Plenio, M. A. Rippin, and P. L. Knight, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 2275 (1997), quant-ph/9702027.
 - [26] M. Christandl and A. Winter, *J. Math. Phys.* **45**, 829 (2004), quant-ph/0308088.
 - [27] M. Christandl and A. Winter, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **45**, 829 (2004), quant-ph/0308088.
 - [28] N. J. Cerf and C. Adami, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 5194 (1997), quant-ph/9512022.
 - [29] M. B. Plenio and S. Virmani, *Quant. Inf. Comput.* **7**, 1 (2007), quant-ph/0504163.
 - [30] I. Devetak and A. Winter, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* **461**, 207 (2005), quant-ph/0306078.
 - [31] R. Renner, Ph.D. thesis, PhD Thesis, 2005 (2005).
 - [32] M. Christandl and A. Winter, *J. Math. Phys.* **45**, 829 (2004), quant-ph/0308088.
 - [33] M. Christandl, N. Schuch, and A. Winter, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **311**, 397 (2012), quant-ph/0910.4151.
 - [34] M. Piani, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 012345 (2006).
 - [35] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 574 (1997).
 - [36] M. Kuś and K. Życzkowski, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 032307 (2001), quant-ph/0006068.
 - [37] L. Gurvits and H. Barnum, *Phys. Rev. A* **66**, 062311 (2002), quant-ph/0204159.
 - [38] E. Knill (2003), Published electronically at <http://qig.itp.uni-hannover.de/qiproblems/15>.
 - [39] F. Verstraete, K. Audenaert, and B. de Moor, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 012316 (2001), quant-ph/0011110.
 - [40] N. Johnston, *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 062330 (2013), 1309.2006.
 - [41] K. Horodecki, L. Pankowski, M. Horodecki, and P. Horodecki, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **54**, 2621 (2008), quant-ph/0506203.
 - [42] R. Alicki and M. Fannes, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen* **37**, L55 (2004), quant-ph/0312081.
 - [43] B. Synak-Radtke and M. Horodecki, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **39**, L423 (2006), quant-ph/0507126.
 - [44] M. Curty, M. Lewenstein, and N. Lütkenhaus, *Physical Review Letters* **92**, 217903 (2004), quant-ph/0307151.
 - [45] M. Fannes, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **31**, 291 (1973).
 - [46] R. Alicki and M. Fannes, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **37**, L55 (2004).
 - [47] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).